

their respective companies at once; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of mass meeting of parents and citizens in Powell School and District of Columbia urging Congress to take immediate action on appropriation bill now pending in Senate as will increase salaries of teachers in public schools 100 per cent; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. GREGG: Petition of residents of Palestine, Texas City, and Crockett, Tex., asking for repeal of postal zone rate bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KAHN: Memorial of San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, urging restoration of powers of Interstate Commerce Commission to suspend rates and indorsing Senate bill 5020; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of San Francisco Chamber of Commerce urging legislation for Roosevelt National Park; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of Dr. and Mrs. Frederick S. Gould, Santa Barbara, Cal., urging favorable consideration of Lewis-Raker bill, conferring military rank upon Army nurses; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Resolution of Connecticut Legislature, urging that principle of self-determination be applied to all small nations, including Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution of Friendly Sons of St. Patrick of Cranston, R. I., urging passage of legislation respecting self-determination for Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of certain residents of Hartford County, Conn., protesting against the luxury-tax provisions in pending revenue bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Hartford, Conn., for providing labor, etc., for honorably discharged men; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce, New Haven, Conn., favoring establishment of league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McFADDEN: Petition of Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America, Lodge No. 904, Sayre, Pa., favoring Government ownership of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORIN: Petition of members of Keystone Council, No. 50, Daughters of America, McKeesport, Pa., Mrs. Annie Townsend, secretary, urging passage of Senate bill 5139; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Woodrow Lodge, No. 1038, I. A. of M., Pitsburgh, Pa., urging Government control of all railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Pennsylvania Confectioners' Association of Pittsburgh, Pa., urging that the revenue act of October 3, 1917, remain in force, thus making the passage of the pending revenue act unnecessary; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Retail Merchants' Association of Pittsburgh, Pa., W. M. Jacoby, secretary, protesting against retention of the luxury taxes in the revenue bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETERS: Petition of Fred C. Ray and other citizens of Hallowell, Me., for national ownership and Government management of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of certain citizens of Uno, Cal., asking for repeal of postal zone law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of women's committee of the California State Council of National Defense, relating to reconstruction problems and policies; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Baldemann Chocolate Co., of San Francisco, Cal., protesting against the proposed revenue bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Santa Barbara (Cal.) Nurses' Association, indorsing the conferring of rank on Army nurses, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Federal Employees Union, No. 1, San Francisco, Cal., urging increased compensation for Government employees; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Mississippi Valley Waterways Association, urging upon Congress the development of inland waterways; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of R. H. Alcorn, chairman, indorsing the Keating retirement bill (H. R. 12352); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of New York Produce Exchange, urging the discontinuance of price-fixing and control of foodstuffs by the Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Western Fruit Jobbers' Association of America, urging the return of Federal-controlled utilities to private ownership; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Union Hardware Co., of Los Angeles, Cal., against the proposed tax of 10 per cent on arms and ammunition; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, requesting Congress to repeal the provisions of the Federal-control act and indorsing Senate bill 5020; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Collins McArthur Candy Co., of San Francisco, Cal., urging against passage of the pending revenue bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANDALL: Petition of Executive Committee, California Teachers' Association, Central Section, favoring creation of a department of education; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Memorial of Baudette Board of Trade, Baudette, Minn., in support of the proposition to provide deeper waterways connection via the St. Lawrence River to the Atlantic; to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

Also, memorial of Brainerd Chamber of Commerce, Brainerd, Minn., in support of the proposition to provide deeper waterways connection via the St. Lawrence River to the Atlantic; to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. WOODYARD: Petition of Blennerhassett Lodge, No. 699, Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, Parkersburg, W. Va., relative to control of railroads by the Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, February 7, 1919.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, with the duties pressing upon us, with the divine call ringing in our hearts for the advance of the interests of Thy people, with the solemn sense of our responsibility to Thee and to our fellow citizens, we begin the service of this day. As we lift our hearts to Thee, as we open them to Thy presence, we pray, Thee to fill us with Thy divine spirit that we may properly discern between the right and the wrong, that we may lead as Thou dost lead us, that we may commit ourselves and our Nation solely to Thy purpose. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when on request of Mr. KING and by unanimous consent the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

SENATOR FROM ILLINOIS.

Mr. SHERMAN. I present the credentials of Hon. MEDILL McCORMICK, duly elected by the people of the State of Illinois a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1919, which I ask to have read and placed on the files.

The credentials were read and ordered to be placed on the files, as follows:

TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 5th day of November, 1918, Hon. MEDILL McCORMICK was duly elected by the people of the State of Illinois a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years beginning on the 4th day of March, 1919.

Witness: His excellency, our governor, Frank O. Lowden, and our seal hereto affixed at Springfield, this 5th day of February, A. D. 1919.

By the governor:
[SEAL.]

LOUIS L. EMMERSON,
Secretary of State.

TRIALS BY COURTS-MARTIAL (S. DOC. NO. 380).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, in response to a Senate resolution, which will be inserted in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

The communication is as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, February 4, 1919.

THE HONORABLE THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the Senate resolution of January 27, 1919, which directs the Secretary of War "to send to the Senate the number of individuals who have been tried and convicted by court-martial proceedings since our entrance into the war, April 6, 1917, together with a brief statement of the offense charged and the nature and extent of the punishment inflicted upon or assessed against each."

This resolution is interpreted by the department to refer to the major offenses tried by the general courts-martial and not to the minor offenses tried by inferior courts. Under the interpretation thus placed upon the resolution, it will be necessary to examine about 22,000 records and approximately three weeks will be required to prepare the report. If the resolution be construed to apply to all minor offenses tried by special and summary courts, it will be necessary to examine about 350,000 additional records in this country and in France, and the preparation of the report will require several months and will necessitate the services of a very large clerical force.

In the belief that the interpretation which, as above stated, has been placed upon this resolution by the department is both in accordance with the intent of the resolution and is necessary in order that action may be taken by the department without undue delay, I have directed that the report to be prepared pursuant to this resolution cover only the approximately 22,000 records of cases tried by general courts-martial.

Trusting that this action will meet with the approval of the Senate, I am,

Respectfully,

NEWTON D. BAKER,
Secretary of War.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate communications from the Assistant Secretary of Labor (S. Doc. No. 383), the Acting United States Food Administrator (S. Doc. No. 382), and the Assistant United States Fuel Administrator (S. Doc. No. 381), transmitting in response to a resolution of December 23, 1918, a list showing the number of civil employees in their respective departments on January 28 and the number discharged during the previous two weeks, which were ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the National Academy of Sciences for the year 1918, which was referred to the Committee on the Library.

CONDITIONS AT ARMY CAMPS IN FRANCE.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I desire to present the following telegram, which I received from New York:

[Telegram.]

NEW YORK, N. Y., February 3, 1919.

Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE,
Washington, D. C.:

Hundreds of wounded soldiers returning complain of insanitary living conditions and of disciplinary measures at American Army classification camp at St. Aignan, France. Boys say they have to stand in mess lines for hours in mud and water over boot tops. Some report wounded dropped dead in lines. Latrines 10 feet from tents. Camp built for 8,000 has 25,000. Guardhouse full of men who violated minor rules. If one-tenth of what returning men say is true, place is hell hole and disgrace to Army and to United States. Boys call it Camp Agony. Urge investigation at once that will assure country something more than a whitewash.

JOHN J. BUSH,
President Michigan Society of New York.

I have the original telegram here, and I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. I trust they will inquire into the condition of that camp.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, on the 2d day of January I introduced a resolution asking for an investigation of certain conditions reported to exist at the camp at Brest, France. The resolution was objected to by Senators on the other side of the Chamber on the ground that an investigation had already been undertaken by the Secretary of War. Since that there has been no communication, to the Senate at least, and no statement given to the public by the Secretary other than the published statement from Maj. Gen. Harbord a day or two after the 3d of January, in which he stated, in response to a telegram sent by the Secretary of War, that while the conditions at Brest were bad, they were improving. That was the general purport of his telegram. Since that, if anything whatever has been done with reference to the improvement of conditions there, no statement of it has ever been given either to Congress or to the public.

I send to the desk and ask that the Secretary may read the following from the Washington Post of this morning, taken from a statement in the New York Telegram of yesterday. I will merely add that within the last 48 hours I have talked with Army officers who left the port of Brest as late as January 17, who, without knowledge of this article at all, have told me of the conditions there, and their statements bear out the statements printed in this article.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to reading the article?

There being no objection, the Secretary read as follows:

BREST CAMP "VILEST"—COST LIVES OF 3,000 UNITED STATES SOLDIERS, SAYS ARMY OFFICER—"PLAYING POLITICS" BLAMED—BARRACKS BUILT FOR 4,000 FRENCH TROOPS MADE TO ACCOMMODATE 12,000 AMERICANS, IT IS ALLEGED—OFFICER WHO ASSERTS "SCANDAL" IS DUE TO INCOMPETENCY.

NEW YORK, February 6.

Based upon information given by a Regular Army officer of high rank, who declares the camp for American troops at Brest "the vilest hole in France," the Evening Telegram prints a six-column article describing the deplorable conditions at the camp.

3,000 UNNECESSARY DEATHS.

The Telegram's article, in part, says:

"The so-called rest camp for American troops at Brest is 'the vilest hole in France.'"

"More than 3,000 American soldiers died there as a result of improper housing and sanitary conditions, and many of these were officially reported as 'killed in action.'"

"Regular Army officers, playing politics and thus dominating National Guard officers, deliberately refused to correct the conditions, which menaced life and caused indescribable hardships."

"One Regular Army officer who had been grossly negligent while in charge at Brest was honored with an important diplomatic mission after the armistice had been signed, while another officer who had done everything in his power to correct conditions at Brest and protect the lives of the men who were obliged to 'rest' there was removed from active command after he had been personally appointed by Gen. Pershing."

MADE BY HIGH ARMY OFFICER.

These charges and many more are laid deliberately before the Evening Telegram by an officer high in rank in the Regular United States Army who has just returned to this country after having spent more than nine months in the midst of the conditions he describes.

Through the whole story told by this officer, whose name is withheld for obvious reasons, runs a plaint regarding the "powers at Tours," where, he intimates, it appeared to be the belief that the Regular officer could do no wrong.

It was to Tours that a certain major was sent "with a whole nest," including a young Austrian who had been raised from cook in the American Army to lieutenant," after charges had been made against him in Brest, only to be given an important task, raised in rank to lieutenant colonel, and the young lieutenant made adjutant of a casual officers' depot.

CONDITIONS LONG A SCANDAL.

The Evening Telegram's informant charges that Brest has been a scandal from the very day it was selected as a rest camp and debarkation port; that an incompetent officer was sent there to organize it and made a miserable failure; that opportunities to obtain or renovate proper buildings for the care of troops was wholly neglected while the men were forced to sleep in "pup tents" without floors, on filthy, muddy ground; that barracks erected by the French for 4,000 troops, and which were terribly overcrowded when 8,000 Russian troops were placed in them, were made to accommodate 12,000 American soldiers.

When Brig. Gen. Nathaniel F. McClure finally was put in charge of the camp, the officer continues, he took over an old slaughterhouse and made it habitable for the troops as they debarked, but as soon as Gen. McClure had been ordered away the renovated slaughterhouse was abandoned and the men once more were sent out into the muddy fields with their floorless pup tents.

READY TO FACE COMMITTEE.

While the officer making these charges would not permit his name to be used, he said that he would be perfectly willing to appear before the Military Affairs Committee of either the House or the Senate at Washington, where his statements would be, or at least "could be," substantiated by reports which now are on file in the War Department, or should be there.

He is certain that a congressional investigation into the conditions at Brest, at least as far as they existed up to last November, must result from the reports which already have been forwarded to Washington. It is said that several officers recently returned from France have been summoned to Washington, and it is believed they will be asked to throw what light they can on the conditions at Brest, which are described in the official reports.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, may I have the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts for just one second? I ask the Senator from Massachusetts, if it meets his approval, to add in his request to have a copy of the telegram which he had read sent to the Secretary of War? I think instead of waiting for the Military Committee, which has much work to do—

Mr. LODGE. I have not the slightest objection.

Mr. LEWIS. Will not the Senator add to his request to have a copy sent immediately to the Secretary of War?

Mr. LODGE. It has been published, and I should be delighted to have it sent to the Secretary of War, but it is wholly useless, if experience is to be any judge.

Mr. LEWIS. I can not accept the latter conclusion. I would regret very much if any Senator felt that he should judge the Secretary of War even before he had an opportunity—

Mr. LODGE. I have not.

Mr. LEWIS. I request the eminent Senator to have a copy sent to the Secretary of War, because I am in receipt of a communication from the Secretary of War, in replying to a complaint that I sent, begging me to assure the Senate that in response to letters such as the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] had received he would be exceedingly pleased if Senators would send these complaints direct to him in person, so that he could immediately start the investigation of every one.

Mr. LODGE. Of course, I am only too delighted to have a copy sent to the Secretary of War, and I have no doubt that the committee will send it, although if he is deeply interested he can probably read it in the daily press or in the RECORD, in which it will appear. I appeal to the committee for an investigation, because I hope and believe it will make an investigation, but I have seen so many cases of references to the War Department which have resulted in suppression and whitewashing that I want something that will tell us the truth.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I would like to make a suggestion. It seems to me that while it is perfectly proper to send a copy of this telegram to the Secretary of War, of course the Secretary of War ought to be informing the Senate in regard to the conditions at the Army camps rather than waiting for newspapers and for the Senate to inform him. The Secretary of War of all men in the land, unless it is the President of the United States, who is Commander in Chief of the Army, ought to know the conditions at these great camps in France.

Mr. NEW. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. NEW. I call the attention of the Senator from Washington to the fact that the course now suggested by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] is exactly the one that was recommended with reference to the resolution I introduced on the 2d day of January. That was brought to the attention of the Secretary of War in the same way, but so far as anyone in Congress or out of it knows, that was the end of that matter.

Mr. LEWIS. If the Senator from Washington will allow me to say—

Mr. POINDEXTER. Just one moment if the Senator please, and then I will take my seat.

Mr. LEWIS. I do not ask the Senator to take his seat. I only wish to respond that the information brought out by the Senator from Massachusetts seems to be a telegram from the President of the Michigan Society setting forth matters which no doubt he must know about in the form of complaint. It will be impossible for the Secretary of War to know of the different complaints which have been made until they are made to him. He could not know these conditions and the subject of the complaint until some one had complained.

Therefore, I think the Senator will realize that the only way he could get information would be to have the complainant send it as quickly as possible, and when it comes to a Senator who puts confidence in the writer, and he presents it to this body, I think the Secretary of War would attach much more importance to it than a newspaper article which we know we read every day ourselves without attaching great weight to all of them.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The matter of these camps in France does not depend entirely upon newspaper articles.

Mr. LEWIS. I am referring rather, may I add, if I may be pardoned, to the telegram of the Senator from Massachusetts. As to the Senator from Indiana, the camp in France not only should be investigated, but it seems to me that from January until now some response could have come, and I join in a regret that officers there have not complied with the request of the Secretary of War with that facility, that quickness, they could have done, for it must be apparent they have not made response, because I am sure the Secretary of War would have sent it to us if there had been any made.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The assertion is made in the article which was read by the Secretary at the request of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW] that an Army officer of considerable rank is authority for the statements contained in it, and these statements have been made from so many different sources that it becomes almost a matter of public knowledge. That statement includes the information that 3,000 men died as the result of insanitary conditions. It is very circumstantial in the account that it gives of the effort which was made by the commander, who was temporarily in charge of certain features of the camp, who had commandeered the buildings and given accommodations in them for troops. He was sent elsewhere and the troops taken out of those buildings in order to go into tents without floors on the wet and mud of the camp which is complained of.

I only rose, however, to emphasize what seems to me to be the principle that ought to govern the conduct of these affairs. My observation is that the Secretary of War rather resents information in regard to failures of the War Department.

Mr. LEWIS. I assure the Senator he has been misinformed as to that.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Well, I may be; but I have observed that, notwithstanding the exposures that have been made by the legislative branch of the Government, sometimes under the leadership of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs

[Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], who is a loyal Democrat, and the report made by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] in regard to airplanes that exposed their bad condition, I do not think it can be successfully contradicted that there was gross inefficiency and a great deal of self-seeking in the conduct of the Aviation Service of the War Department, with the result that the war ended, and after we had been in it considerably over a year, and this great manufacturing country, the richest and the most efficient in the world, had not produced one plane of attack, but had depended entirely upon our allies—now, I believe that I can make this statement without fear of contradiction, that there can not be produced by the Senator from Illinois or by anybody else a single word from the Secretary of War condemning that colossal scandal. On the contrary, he defended it.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President—

Mr. POINDEXTER. Just one second. My impression is that the Secretary of War first, of all the citizens of this country, ought to condemn it and to exorcise it and expose it and punish the men who are responsible for it; but the attitude that he has taken is an attitude of justification and excuse and defense where he ought to be the agent of punishment and the exposé of truth and of inefficiency; but he depends upon the legislative branch of the Government to inform him, the head of the department, of conditions which he first of all ought to know.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I present a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution [J. Res. No. 19, A] relating to the tobacco industry and requesting the Federal Trade Commission to report on such industry.

Whereas during the fall of 1918 the price of tobacco was approximately 40 cents per pound at a time when all the markets of the central powers and most of the markets of the neutral powers were not being supplied; and

Whereas upon the cessation of hostilities, and continuing to the present time, the price of this product dropped to 20 cents per pound, notwithstanding the fact that world commerce had opened up and the tobacco markets of Europe were waiting to be supplied; and

Whereas the tobacco farmers of Wisconsin, while of the opinion that such a decline in the price of their product is not justified by existing conditions, desire to be properly informed, so that if such decline is based upon good reasons continued good relations may exist between buyer and seller; and

Whereas the matter is of the most serious consequence to all business interests in our State, due to the fact that the decline in price, if continued, would mean a loss of approximately \$8,000,000 to the producers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly, the senate concurring, That the Federal Trade Commission be respectfully requested to at once investigate the conditions of the tobacco industry and to make a report to the present legislature with all convenient speed, such investigation and report to be of such nature as to fully advise the tobacco producers of the true causes of the present market conditions: And be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the chairman of said commission at Washington, D. C., to each of the two Senators, and to the Congressmen from this State.

EDWARD F. DITTMAR,
President of the Senate.
O. G. MUNDON,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
RILEY S. YOUNG,
Speaker of the Assembly.
C. E. SHAFFER,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I present a resolution unanimously adopted at the regular meeting of the Manufacturers' Association of Wilmington, Del., held in their office Wednesday, February 5, 1919, relative to a bill now pending before Congress carrying an appropriation of over \$14,000,000 for the purpose of perpetuating and enlarging the United States Employment Service, which was created to aid the Federal Government in coordinating the interests of the country for war production. I move that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MOSES. I present a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire, relative to the extermination of insects and pests, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution adopted by the New Hampshire Legislature February 5, 1919. Whereas a new, important, and exceedingly dangerous insect pest known as the European borer has gained foothold in certain areas in eastern Massachusetts;

Whereas this new pest if not controlled is expected to cause extraordinary damage to our most valuable field crops and vegetables throughout the entire United States and may render unprofitable the growing of such important crops as field corn;

Whereas such opportunity as may still exist for suppression of the pest will speedily disappear as the insect spreads beyond the present limited territory: Be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States is hereby urged to make immediate appropriations whereby adequate measures of suppression of this pest may be undertaken without delay by the proper Federal authorities.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of the Minnesota Independent Telephone Association, of Minneapolis, Minn., praying that Congress fix a definite date for the return of the telephone lines to their owners, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a telegram in the nature of a petition from A. G. Rugles, State entomologist, of St. Paul, Minn., praying that an appropriation of \$500,000 be made for the extermination of the corn borer, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of the Growers' Association of Minnesota, of St. Paul, Minn., praying that the so-called "market reporting service" be continued and that provision be made therefor in the Agriculture appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a memorial of Local Union No. 871, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, of Battle Creek, Mich., remonstrating against the operation of the Federal employment system as now constituted, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. HALE presented a petition of the Woman's Literary Union, of Androscoggin County, Me., praying for the establishment of a department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I present a resolution adopted by the Common Council of Detroit, Mich., which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF DETROIT, January 23, 1919.

Hon. CHARLES E. TOWNSEND,

Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am transmitting herewith copy of a resolution presented by Councilman Bielman and adopted by the common council at the session of January 21 relative to congressional action to provide funds for men discharged from the Army or Navy:

"From: The clerk:

"To: The honorable the Common Council.

"GENTLEMEN: I beg to advise your honorable body that I am in receipt of the following communication from the American Red Cross.

"Respectfully submitted.

"RICHARD LINDSAY,

"City Clerk.

"The following is the communication referred to:

"Mr. RICHARD LINDSAY,
"City Clerk.

"DEAR SIR: I am inclosing herewith a resolution which, at the suggestion of Councilman Lodge, I have drawn up as a result of a meeting of a number of men who represent organizations caring for the returned soldier, and while I can not, as a Red Cross official, perhaps, urge such action, as a private citizen I can and do most earnestly, so that men who have gone from Detroit may be saved, so far as possible, the humiliation of standing around in their uniforms until some good-natured person hands them a job.

"There is a fundamental question of right in this matter which can not be overlooked, and we want our city to be among the first to recognize this obligation to her citizens.

"Very truly, yours,

"G. D. POPE."

"By Councilman Bielman:

"Whereas citizens of this community liable for military service have met in full that obligation to our country, leaving their homes and their affairs to bear their part in the military duty required to uphold justice and the ideals of this Nation; and

"Whereas, their work accomplished, they are now being returned to this community at a time when industrial readjustments make their reentry into industry exceedingly difficult, and inasmuch as this city and this Nation owe these men an unpayable debt of gratitude and obligation, and should in no wise permit the burden and sacrifice of unemployment to fall unsupported upon those who have already sacrificed so much in our service: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That it be, and hereby is, the opinion of this body that such steps should be taken by the War Department, or, if need be, congressional action, which will immediately provide funds for men discharged or about to be discharged from the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps as will be sufficient to support them properly for a period of 60 to 90 days after their discharge and pending their return to their former positions as self-supporting citizens: Furthermore, be it

"Resolved, That a copy of this motion be forwarded to our Representatives in the Senate and House, with the urgent request that such action will be taken as will secure the immediate realization of this proposal.

"Yeas—Councilmen Bielman, Bradley, Castator, Kronk, Littlefield, Nagel, Simons, Vernor, and the president.

"Nays—None."

Yours, very truly,

RICHARD LINDSAY,

City Clerk.

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I present a memorial from the Board of Trustees of the Takoma Branch of the American Protective League, representing about a thousand of the best citizens there, who have given a great deal of their

time, in connection with the prosecution of the war, in aiding the various branches of the Government in the detection of sedition and disloyalty, and all that sort of thing. In this memorial they set out in concise form their conclusions from what they have ascertained and learned as to what ought to be done.

I ask that the memorial be printed in the RECORD, and as they make recommendation with reference to immigration and naturalization, I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Immigration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, it will be so ordered.

The memorial referred to is as follows:

To the honorable the Congress of the United States of America:

The undersigned, the board of trustees of the Tacoma Branch of the American Protective League, respectfully represent:

That immediately after the declaration of the war with Germany a part of their number, with several hundred other American citizens of Tacoma, organized the Tacoma Home Guards, and, about the same time, others of their number organized the Tacoma Minutemen, and in their respective organizations they acted from the start in the general direction, management, and control of the various activities of said organizations; that after a few months of separate operation they amalgamated in the American Protective League, with a combined membership of more than 1,000, and they, your memorialists, became the managing and directing board of said combined force, and have continued to act as such to this date, January 27, 1919.

That during said entire period of 22 months they have in person, and through their entire membership of more than 1,000 persons, as well as by volunteer investigators and paid detectives, been engaged in aiding all departments of the United States Government, and particularly the Department of Justice and the Army, in the work of guarding and protecting property, discovering, preventing, and punishing disloyalty, aiding Army enlistments, enforcement of the selective-service laws, arresting deserters and slackers, and generally doing such war service as could be found to do.

That in carrying on such work a vast number of investigations were made, and a great mass of information gathered, from which we have become profoundly impressed with the necessity for prompt revision of the Federal laws relating to both immigration and naturalization. We must be better protected against the immigration and naturalization of all persons not likely to become attached to the principles embodied in our Constitution and laws, or become industrious, law-abiding, and patriotic citizens. We have had a rude awakening.

While we have found many of our foreign-born citizens splendidly loyal, we have also found an astonishing number to be only half American in real sentiment, and very many positively disloyal and hostile to the United States in its hour of need. We know that fear has bridled many a tongue and stayed many a hand.

We find that among the disloyal, and preachers of disobedience to law, destruction of property, and general seditious conduct, fully 90 per cent are foreign born or of foreign parentage, and this in a population 77 per cent of which is native born. We find that the dangerous unrest now prevalent, and which promises to become more acute, is almost entirely the result of propaganda carried on by a naturally seditious element of foreign birth, many of whom have come here expressly to find a freer and more fertile field for their propaganda.

It is our unanimous and deliberate judgment that, unless a speedy cure is provided by the enactment of properly protective immigration and naturalization laws, irreparable harm will result to the people of the United States.

Such legislation must contain whatever provisions as are necessary to really accomplish the desired purpose, and while some inconvenience may be occasioned to a few excellent people, this fact must not be allowed to stand in the way of accomplishing the necessary reform.

We have the honor to submit the following suggestions as an outline of some provisions which ought, in our judgment, to be embodied in proposed legislation:

First. Pending passage of other laws and organizing the administration thereof, stop all immigration, with only necessary exceptions.

Second. All persons coming into the United States should be required to fill out, in the country from which they come, a questionnaire, giving a true history of their lives, showing their education, times and places and kinds of employment, if convicted of any crime, the time, place, and circumstances, whether felony or misdemeanor, social, and other organizations of which applicant is or has been a member, and all other pertinent facts upon which a fair judgment of character may be founded. Such document should be made before a United States consular or immigration officer, resident in the foreign country, and filed with him at least 90 days prior to date of expected embarkation for the United States. Such officer should then make investigation as to fitness of applicant to become a resident and citizen of our country, and, if found worthy, issue to him a certificate to that effect, and make a similar indorsement on the questionnaire. If found not worthy, certificate should be refused, and that fact indorsed on questionnaire.

All questionnaires to be filed in and become a permanent record in the proper office in the United States.

If approval has been given, applicant may enter United States as an immigrant, subject to the final approval of United States at place of entry into the United States.

After entry into the United States the immigrant should be required to learn to intelligently speak, read, and write the English language within two years, after learning which, and after two years, he may declare his intention to become a citizen, which he may complete after an additional period of five years.

In order that proper track may be kept of his conduct, a system of registration should be required, with proper officers in the various places of his residence, at all times up to time of admission to citizenship.

Failure on part of foreigners to comply with any or all laws, rules, and regulations relating to foreigners resident in the United States, either temporarily or permanently, or engaging in riots, or any breach of State or Federal law, and advocating, or associating with others who advocate, any kind of unlawful violence, sedition, breach of law, overthrow of lawful authority or government, should subject the foreigner to punishment or deportation or both at the discretion of the United States.

On making application for admission to citizenship he should again make out and file with his application a questionnaire, giving a complete history of his life in detail, and at least three months prior to

time fixed for hearing the application, to allow of thorough investigation into the life of applicant by Federal agents. Any willfully untrue statement made or pertinent fact covered up should bar admission and be followed by deportation if fraudulent intent is found to exist.

The law should provide that after admission to citizenship retention of that right is a trust subject to forfeiture at any time for sufficient cause, such as conviction of felony, unpardoned advocacy of violence or disorder, engaging in or advising riots, advising, aiding, or abetting seditious or disorderly conduct by others, or any conduct which the proper Federal authority may find calculated to undermine orderly and efficient government.

All such laws should be made to apply to foreigners and naturalized citizens now here, as well as those yet to come, for no man has any right to hold a citizenship the privileges of which he abuses, nor has he a right to retain citizenship in any country and at the same time advocate its destruction.

Vigorous sedition laws should be at once enacted if the war measures now in force are either inadequate or inapplicable in times of peace, and these laws would, of course, apply to foreigners and citizens alike, in so far as punishments go. We, your memorialists, have, however, become so deeply convinced that all seditious organizations and propaganda are traceable so largely to the undesirable foreign element possessing no adequate conception of the fundamental principles of our Government, and knowing no distinction between the true liberty of a self-governing people and individual license to act without restraint, that no permanent relief can be had until all foreigners of seditious tendencies are not only barred from citizenship but from entry into the country, and, if already here, are denied the right to remain.

With proper regulations relating to foreigners engaging in business, and travelers, for specified and limited periods, we believe the foregoing general proposition will, if acted on promptly and fearlessly, save our country from grave dangers and disorders.

We are gravely apprehensive of after-war conditions, when Europe shall settle down to orderly government and its Bolsheviks seek the freedom of America to carry on its propaganda of tyranny and destruction, and we, therefore, pray your earnest, prompt, and conscientious consideration of these momentous problems, always having in mind that you are representing the American people, for whose benefit and protection its laws should be primarily made.

Respectfully submitted this 27th day of January, 1919.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF TACOMA BRANCH,
AMERICAN PROTECTIVE LEAGUE,
D. D. A. OUTCALT, *President*,
J. H. HOLME, *Secretary*.

PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Pensions, submitted a report (No. 690) accompanied by a bill (S. 5553) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and of wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, which was read twice by its title, the bill being a substitute for the following Senate bills heretofore referred to that committee:

S. 201. Charles F. Cavanaugh.
S. 254. Milton M. Lile.
S. 327. Amme A. Wilson.
S. 1073. Charles B. Smith.
S. 1501. Edward Flannery.
S. 1731. Thomas Kent.
S. 1958. Palmyra Johnson.
S. 2132. James H. Criswell.
S. 2195. Andrew E. Waterman.
S. 2251. Henry L. Henrysen.
S. 3049. Isaac F. Roberts.
S. 3107. Eugene M. Symonds.
S. 3290. Mary E. Allen.
S. 3497. Frank H. Seay.
S. 3590. William H. Hart.
S. 3706. Thomas J. Scanlain.
S. 3866. Arthur G. Bosson.
S. 4214. Albert Grimes.
S. 4326. James L. Graham.
S. 4331. David Britton.
S. 4335. George W. Carter.
S. 4411. John Clark.
S. 4412. George E. Lawrence.
S. 4545. Charles Weiffle.
S. 4579. Mary Melissa Anderson.
S. 4655. Wilfred W. Phaneuf.
S. 4657. Rufus H. Hopkins.
S. 4730. Ulysses S. G. Canfield.
S. 4737. Joseph J. Horan.
S. 4744. Dennis Driscoll.
S. 4756. James D. Wilder.
S. 4778. Lemuel Lunger.
S. 4796. George Moir.
S. 4821. Charles H. Skillings.
S. 4845. Elizabeth E. Baker.
S. 4846. John F. Mannel.
S. 4851. Joseph W. Culbertson.
S. 4863. Elvina Adams.
S. 4867. Ellen Jones.
S. 4880. Cornelia A. Nickels.
S. 4908. James J. Butler.
S. 4935. Susan Owens.
S. 4958. John Franklin Haynes.

S. 4977. Marion T. Mitchell.
S. 4978. Francis E. Searway.
S. 5007. John J. Duke.
S. 5009. Emeline A. Spaulding.
S. 5046. Jacob D. Emery.
S. 5110. Lily D. Murphy.
S. 5111. Albert L. Newland.
S. 5124. George W. McMahan.
S. 5196. Oscar S. Pomeroy.
S. 5209. David W. Herriman.
S. 5219. Edwin W. Gordon.
S. 5252. John Daley.
S. 5310. Charles F. Hahn.
S. 5330. Arthur H. Letts.
S. 5379. Carrier Thompson.
S. 5381. Floyd E. Driskel.
S. 5399. Sarah Hale.
S. 5454. Amanda F. Mahin.
S. 5527. William W. Treadway.
S. 5529. Benjamin H. Kimbler.
S. 5530. Lee Begley.
S. 5531. Henry Fields.
S. 5532. Charley Shelton.

Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Pensions, submitted a report (No. 691) accompanied by a bill (S. 5554) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, which was read twice by its title, the bill being a substitute for the following Senate bills heretofore referred to that committee:

S. 1053. Jonathan M. Ragner.
S. 1314. Peter L. Leuszler.
S. 1346. R. W. Duncan, alias "Pack" Duncan.
S. 1717. Mary E. Williams.
S. 1718. Mary Alcinda Wingert.
S. 1841. Leonora V. Lunt.
S. 2226. William H. Makee.
S. 2556. Charles E. Haskell.
S. 2699. Sarah Van Doozer.
S. 2819. Anna F. Baugh.
S. 2880. Esther U. McKelvey.
S. 2892. Mary Snow.
S. 2971. Martha A. Tucker.
S. 3014. Mary M. Ayer.
S. 3042. Frederick Deppe.
S. 3044. Eliza E. Herman.
S. 3048. George N. Morse.
S. 3145. Hilda Johnson.
S. 3279. Sarah F. Steele.
S. 3281. Josiah McKnight.
S. 3282. Sylvester H. Gaskill.
S. 3292. Jennie Magee.
S. 3345. Henrietta Buswell Brown.
S. 3377. Joseph Masden.
S. 3423. Mary L. Colnay.
S. 3466. Cora W. Merryman.
S. 3623. Alexander D. Tanyer.
S. 3628. W. Lafayette League.
S. 3650. Mary Hermann.
S. 3651. Clara Stillman.
S. 3712. Mary Rumbold.
S. 3850. Nancy J. Bower.
S. 3854. William H. Henkle.
S. 3855. Camm T. Sanders.
S. 4050. John T. Showalter.
S. 4173. Cora C. O'Neill.
S. 4377. Anna C. Seaman.
S. 4384. Davis Parsons.
S. 4386. Frances L. Haha.
S. 4461. Abbie B. Garrett.
S. 4577. Susan E. Guyn.
S. 4582. William McDonald.
S. 4585. John W. Huffman.
S. 4589. Boman R. Butcher.
S. 4615. Henry H. Niles.
S. 4680. Charles F. Perry.
S. 4695. James Hanners.
S. 4704. Catherine A. Brownlee.
S. 4705. Ida B. Willison.
S. 4718. George Graham.
S. 4751. Albert F. Nelson.
S. 4757. Lewis Newman.
S. 4764. John W. Combs.
S. 4788. Elizabeth Hagadorn.
S. 4797. Ida V. Haskins.

S. 4804. Clara E. Buckland.
 S. 4809. Henry M. Chase.
 S. 4834. William T. Potts.
 S. 4847. Louisa Jones.
 S. 4853. Andrew J. Moody.
 S. 4869. William F. Blanchard.
 S. 4896. William B. Douglas.
 S. 4898. Emeline C. Starr.
 S. 4903. Samuel Lockwood.
 S. 4905. Ella A. Mead.
 S. 4920. Isaac D. Hamilton.
 S. 4926. Charles Wiley.
 S. 4927. Newell Strout.
 S. 4933. Lucy A. Schriver.
 S. 4943. Jesse W. Bowdle.
 S. 4981. Sarah M. Geiger.
 S. 5012. Isabell Cunningham.
 S. 5021. James H. Cornell.
 S. 5031. Lucina E. Smith.
 S. 5078. James C. Daly.
 S. 5091. Jennie L. Barrows.
 S. 5103. Mary M. Hood.
 S. 5106. Amos L. Hood.
 S. 5107. Henry H. Hering.
 S. 5118. Charles Blitz.
 S. 5131. Maranda E. McHaffie.
 S. 5142. George F. Griffith, alias Frank W. Morton.
 S. 5145. Carrie E. Hewett.
 S. 5164. Robert B. Patrick.
 S. 5165. George F. Hood.
 S. 5166. Stewart Orr.
 S. 5184. Effie E. Milton.
 S. 5204. Hermann Hoffmeister.
 S. 5218. Alonzo R. Cole.
 S. 5225. Sarah F. Robinson.
 S. 5241. George Forker.
 S. 5242. Georgia M. Hodgson.
 S. 5253. Milton W. Burnhan.
 S. 5268. Sarah C. Vaughan.
 S. 5272. James H. Johnston.
 S. 5276. John F. Lichty.
 S. 5324. Rouser Mettler.
 S. 5383. Arabella Roberts.
 S. 5387. Alonzo J. Finch.
 S. 5407. Levi M. Starne.
 S. 5411. Catharine Derstine.
 S. 5418. Horton Mosher.
 S. 5425. Alexander Faries.
 S. 5427. Jacob R. Stillwagon.
 S. 5455. Franklin Bryan.
 S. 5466. William Dugent.
 S. 5468. Benjamin A. Sturtevant.
 S. 5481. William E. Hughes.
 S. 5483. James Roland.
 S. 5501. Edward D. Hamilton.
 S. 5509. William J. Vanhoose.
 S. 5519. Daniel C. Darlington.
 S. 5520. Mary A. Lake.
 S. 5524. Isaac N. White.

MAHONING RIVER BRIDGE, OHIO.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 12995) granting the consent of Congress to the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a combined bridge and dam across the Mahoning River, in the State of Ohio, and I submit a report thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill just reported by him. Is there objection?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, does this bill provide for the construction of a dam across a river? If it does, that is a new proposition—the construction of a combined bridge and dam.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I ask the Secretary to read the bill.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, operate, and maintain a combined bridge and dam and approaches thereto across the Mahoning River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation at or near the town of Struthers, county of Mahoning, State of Ohio, in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906: *Provided,* That no dam constructed under the consent hereby granted shall be used to develop water power nor to generate electricity.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think the bill had better go over until we have an opportunity to examine it. That is certainly a strange combination—a bridge and dam across a navigable stream.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The War Department has approved the bill, and it seemed to be an ordinary bridge bill.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think I shall have to ask that it go over.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I withdraw the report for the present.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I have no objection to the report being withdrawn.

NIAGARA RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 5534) granting the consent of Congress to Oliver Cabana, jr., Myron S. Hall, E. G. Connette, William F. MacGlashan, John H. Bradley, and M. A. Hurt to construct a bridge across Niagara River within or near the city limits of Buffalo, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 694) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MAHONING RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 12996) granting the consent of Congress to the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mahoning River, in the State of Ohio, and I submit a report (No. 692) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE RED RIVER OF THE NORTH.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 13232) to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Red River of the North, between Traill County, N. Dak., and Polk County, Minn., and I submit a report (No. 693) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MAHONING RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 12997) granting the consent of Congress to the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mahoning River, in the State of Ohio, and I submit a report (No. 695) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PENSION APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. WALSH. From the Committee on Pensions I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 15219) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 696) thereon.

Mr. President, although this bill carries a very large appropriation, there are no authorizations contained in it, but simply provision for the payment of pensions authorized by general legislation and by other bills. It is the usual appropriation bill, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the payment of pensions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, namely:

Army and Navy pensions, as follows: For invalids, widows, minor children, and dependent relatives, Army nurses, and all other pensioners who are now borne on the rolls, or who may hereafter be placed thereon, under the provisions of any and all acts of Congress, \$215,000,000: *Provided,* That the appropriation aforesaid for Navy pensions shall be

paid from the income of the Navy pension fund, so far as the same shall be sufficient for that purpose: *Provided further*, That the amount expended under each of the above items shall be accounted for separately. For fees and expenses of examining surgeons, pensions, for services rendered within the fiscal year 1920, \$30,000.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, and read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the bill pass? The bill was passed.

AMENDMENT OF WAR-RISK INSURANCE ACT.

Mr. THOMAS. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 621, being the bill (H. R. 13273) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a bureau of war-risk insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, and an act in amendment thereto, approved October 6, 1917.

I may state that the bill has passed the House, and the Secretary of the Treasury has informed the chairman of the Finance Committee that its enactment into law is urgently essential to the efficient administration of the war-risk insurance act. It is very short.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a bureau of war-risk insurance in the Treasury Department" be, and is hereby, amended by adding the following new paragraph to section 210 of Article II of the said act:

"Provided, however, That whenever the commissioner shall by further investigation or reinvestigation modify the existing award, no reimbursement from the person receiving an allowance shall be required for allotments and allowances already paid nor shall any deductions be made from allotments and allowances to be paid in the future for any change in award made in previous allotments and allowances, except where it is conclusively shown that the person receiving the allowance does not bear the relationship to the enlisted man which is required by the act and except in cases of manifest fraud."

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SIMMONS:

A bill (S. 5555) to amend the war-risk insurance act; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BECKHAM (for Mr. WILLIAMS):

A bill (S. 5556) to provide for the erection of memorials and the entombment of bodies in the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater, in Arlington National Cemetery, Va.; to the Committee on the Library.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. THOMAS submitted an amendment authorizing the President to appoint Col. William C. Brown, United States Army, retired, to the rank of brigadier general on the retired list, intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. FLETCHER submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$125,000 for promoting and developing the farm and domestic commerce of the United States, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the legislative, etc., appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

Mr. PENROSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 14945) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions and ordered to be printed.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. FLETCHER (for Mr. WILLIAMS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

THE CENSUS CONFERENCE REPORT.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Reports of committees are in order.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I ask that the conference report on the Census bill be laid before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11984) to provide for the Fourteenth and subsequent decennial censuses.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I move the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I understood that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE] was interested in this conference report. I will ask the Senator from Texas if he knows anything about that? I may be mistaken, but I was under the impression that the Senator from Maryland was interested in this matter and wished to be present when it was brought up for consideration.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I shall state to the Senator that the time is so short until adjournment that I do not believe it will be fair to the bill to hold it up until any particular Senator can be present, but if the Senator from Maryland is not present I shall not insist on considering the conference report now.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It may be that the Senator from Maryland may not be interested. Does the Senator from Texas know whether or not the Senator from Maryland is interested in this report?

Mr. SHEPPARD. The Senator from Maryland is interested in the report.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I hope, then, that the Senator from Texas will not bring it up just now. I do not know why the Senator from Maryland is absent; I know he is generally here.

Mr. LENROOT. The Senator from Maryland has been sent for.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I understand that the Senator from Maryland has been sent for and will be here in a short time. So I ask the Senator from Texas to withhold action on the report for a little while.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Very well; that is satisfactory to me.

SENATOR FROM MICHIGAN.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] for just a moment, I desire to state that, in view of certain statements which were made by the Senator from Michigan, as well as by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], on yesterday toward the close of the afternoon's debate, I shall not press Senate resolution 415 at the present time. I shall meanwhile hope to confer with the members of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and if it is deemed desirable shall call them together with a view of arranging some plan which will prove satisfactory.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I have no objection at all to that arrangement. I wish it thoroughly understood by the Senator, in order that there shall be no misunderstanding, that I should like to know before the plan is put out, if I may be granted that courtesy, as to what the Senator's idea is as to the proposed resolution. If he intends to introduce another one I shall be glad to cooperate with him.

Mr. POMERENE. I think the Senator from Michigan should be kept fully informed, and I shall be glad to keep in touch with him on the subject.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The other day when I called the attention of the Senate to an advertisement or an appeal to the American Bolsheviks by Nikolai Lenine, published in the St. Louis Post Dispatch, I stated that it appeared to be an advertisement. I am informed that it was not and that I was mistaken. I know the Post Dispatch to be a paper of high standing and the gentlemen who manage it to be gentlemen of character, and I very gladly withdraw the statement. It was published as a reprint of an article which appeared in a magazine in New York edited by Max Eastman. I am very glad to make the statement that it was published as a matter of news.

SHIP WORKERS' STRIKE.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, in view of what has been stated heretofore in connection with the shipbuilders' strike on the Pacific coast I submit an interview had with Mr. Charles Piez, Director General of the Emergency Fleet Corporation, on that subject, which I believe will be somewhat enlightening and perhaps clear up the situation to some extent.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I desire to suggest to the Senator from Florida that I have already had put into the Record all of the statements that have been called to my attention by Mr. Piez. I put in an interview and statements, I think, a couple of days ago, and then on yesterday I had inserted in the Record subsequent statements purporting to be an interview and a statement by Mr. Piez. They are the ones I received from Mr. Piez yesterday morning in the mail.

Mr. FLETCHER. Perhaps it is the same thing. It is an interview that was to be issued February 4, I believe.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes.

Mr. FLETCHER. And a subsequent one. I did not know but that this might be subsequent to what the Senator has offered; but perhaps it covers the same ground.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I am inclined to think that it covers the same ground.

Mr. FLETCHER. Very well. Then I will not make the request.

BOLSHEVIKI PROPAGANDA IN WASHINGTON.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, Mr. Judson King, who, it is stated, was the chairman of a meeting at Poli's Theater, concerning which the Senate has ordered an investigation, and as to which there has been considerable discussion, has written a letter to Senators and Representatives denying flatly the statements in the newspapers which caused the controversy. He called upon me this morning and expressed a desire that that letter be placed in the RECORD. I was not present at the meeting; I know nothing of the facts concerning it; but I think it is only fair, in view of what has occurred, that this letter be inserted in the RECORD, and I make that request.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, before that request is agreed to—

Mr. KING. I think that I shall object to the request. This matter is before the committee for investigation, and if this gentleman desires vindication, if he thinks he has been injured, doubtless he will have full opportunity. I object.

Mr. LENROOT. Before the Senator from Utah objects—

Mr. THOMAS. Will the Senator allow me a word?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I think that, inasmuch as the meeting referred to has been criticized, those who have been subjected to criticism are entitled to be heard through the columns of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I have excoriated individuals occasionally since I have been here, perhaps unjustly, but I have never declined, no matter how personally abusive the reply was, to insert in the RECORD, if requested, the answers which have been made to me upon my position. I think it but fair and just. If I say something about a man that is wrong, I want to be the first to know it and to apologize. In any event, he has the right to be heard by way of reply.

Mr. LENROOT. I wish to suggest that in this statement there is no reflection upon any Senator.

Mr. KING. I had supposed that it was a rebuke of the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], who had called the attention of the Senate to the matter, but with the assurance of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], I withdraw the objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would not permit a document of that kind to go into the RECORD.

Mr. ASHURST. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the Chair decide it. Without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The letter referred to is as follows:

3015 FOURTEENTH STREET NW.,

Washington, D. C., February 6, 1919.

To Members of the Senate and House of Representatives:

For your information permit me to state that at the meeting at Poli's Theater Sunday afternoon, at which I presided, there was no advocacy of anarchy or violence, no attack upon the American form of government, and no propaganda that Bolshevism be adopted in our country. The well-nigh unanimous sentiment of audience and speakers was that American troops be withdrawn and Russia be permitted to settle her own fate in her own way.

The article in Monday's Washington Post, headed "Urge Red America," is an absurd perversion of the truth and a gross violation of journalistic ethics. Discussions in Congress regarding this meeting, based, apparently, upon this article, have proceeded under a misapprehension of facts. Whether any attempt was made to verify the truth of the article I do not know. No inquiry was made of me.

Far from being a meeting of "reds," the gathering was attended by hundreds of cultured men and women of this city, of every political party and of every creed and class, including clergymen, who have no sympathy with Bolshevik methods or even the economic principles of socialism. No protest from those in attendance has reached me; many have expressed appreciation of the facts learned from Mr. Williams's address and are ready to testify that the sort of publicity given to the meeting is false, disgusting, and an insult to intelligence.

I am informed by the secretary of the committee having the meeting in charge that an invitation was mailed to every Member of Congress. This letter stated:

"The purpose of the meeting is to afford citizens of Washington opportunity to learn what is happening in Russia, not to propagate Bolshevism."

That purpose was adhered to.

The meeting did not originate with me. I was asked to preside, and did so on my own responsibility. I had learned in Boston, Mr. Williams's home city, from men who differ with his opinions, of his high character and ability. I had read his articles in reputable magazines and knew he had given the address proposed to be given here before the American Academy of Political and Social Science and at the City Club in Philadelphia, at Ford Hall and the Economic League in Boston, at the Church of the Holy Trinity in Brooklyn, the Church of the Ascension in New York, and other places. I knew the Department of Justice was fully advised as to Mr. Williams and what he was saying,

and concluded that what would not contaminate Boston, New York, and Philadelphia would not injure Washington.

Mr. Williams delivered his usual address here, a typewritten copy of which was handed by him to a Post reporter at the meeting, but which was falsified in the report.

Myself and other nonsocialist citizens of this city will welcome any investigation of this open meeting, with the hope—perhaps vain—that the same publicity be given the truth as was given the distortion. At bottom this is the old question of free speech and as to whether a respectable audience of American citizens can peaceably assemble to ascertain the truth about a public issue without being lied about, vilified, and intimidated.

I respectfully suggest that, if hearings are held, the committee be empowered to extend an inquiry as to whether there is a conspiracy afoot to prevent the American people from learning the truth about Russia.

Respectfully, yours,

JUDSON KING.

MEN OF MOTOR TRANSPORT CORPS AT GUM SPRINGS, VA.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I submit a resolution for reference to the Committee on Military Affairs. I ask to have the resolution read.

The resolution (S. Res. 442) was read, as follows:

Whereas the men composing Company 553 of the Motor Transport Corps, now located at Gum Springs, near Alexandria, Va., were enlisted in the mechanical course of the University of Wisconsin and the mechanical courses maintained by the Government at many other places for the special training of men for services in the Motor Transport Corps; and

Whereas these men received this special training from June 15 to August 15, 1918, at which time they were sent to the aforesaid camp at Gum Springs, Va.; and

Whereas since August 15, 1918, to date this company has not been employed in motor-transport work, but has been employed in road-building work; and

Whereas the men of this company have been working at soldiers' pay for from 10 to 12 hours a day and doing the same character of work and employed alongside of colored civilian labor employed by a contractor who had a contract for building this road, and who paid this colored civilian labor at the rate of \$4.50 and upward per day of eight hours; and

Whereas while they have been thus employed these men have received no military training and no training to make them more efficient in the Motor Transport Service, but have been continuously employed as common laborers; and

Whereas many of these men are married, with families and parents dependent upon them, many have business interests at home urgently requiring their personal attention, further absence from which will in many cases result in irreparable loss, and many others have lucrative employment awaiting them if they could secure prompt discharge from the Army; and

Whereas members of this company have filed or attempted to file applications for discharge with the commanding officer, who has refused to consider such applications upon their merits, except in a few instances where Senators and Representatives have, after long delay, succeeded in obtaining a discharge; and

Whereas in the presence of the men the commanding officer has on numerous occasions stated that no discharges will be granted nor will any applications for discharge be favorably recommended by said officer; and

Whereas these men did not and would not make any complaint so long as the country was at war, but cheerfully performed this labor to which they were assigned, although it was not the service for which they were trained; and

Whereas the road work upon which they were employed is completed, and there is no reason for the continuance in the service of Company 553 or Company 516 of the Motor Transport Service, which is similarly situated, has been similarly treated, and is under the same command: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs, or a subcommittee of said committee, be, and it is hereby, directed to investigate the Gum Springs camp and ascertain and report to the Senate at the earliest possible date upon the following questions:

(1) Is there any military necessity for longer retaining these organizations in the service?

(2) Have the officers of these companies discouraged the filing of applications for discharge, neglected and delayed action upon applications filed with them, and refused discharges in cases upon which they have acted, without any just reason therefor, or for the purpose of maintaining their own places while they have been personally seeking new assignments for themselves or for the organizations?

(3) Have the men of either of these companies been from time to time required to perform services other than in the line of military duty?

(4) The committee is directed to make a like investigation and report as to the Motor Transport Service located at Camp Humphreys and other camps in the vicinity of Washington, D. C.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask to have the resolution referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be so referred.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, as I understand, this resolution has been referred to the committee?

The VICE PRESIDENT. To the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I received a letter a few days ago on behalf of three or four enlisted men at this station. They did not set out in detail all the matters referred to in this resolution, but they did state that they had been employed at road work alongside men who were getting from four and a half dollars to, I think they said, ten dollars a day. They also stated that the commanding officer had stated publicly that he would not receive applications for discharge; that he would not give them any consideration whatever. They could not understand why this was done. They stated in this letter that they were perfectly willing to do this kind of work, or any kind of work, while the war was going on, any work necessary to the

prosecution of the war, but they could not understand why they were to be kept in the service, working alongside of men who were getting many times the pay that they were getting, and work not at all connected with the prosecution of the war.

I took up the matter with the War Department. They advised me there, of course, that the commanding officer had no right to announce that he would not receive applications for discharge, and they assured me that they would take up the matter at once with the proper official. I have stated all the facts that were set out in the letter; but, as I say, they did not refer to many of the things referred to in this resolution.

I hope the resolution will be acted upon by the committee, and acted upon very promptly, because it seems to me there is a wholly unwarranted and unjustifiable condition of things at this Gum Springs Motor Transport Camp.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I think the fact is that the War Department has vested in the commanding officer the right to make discharges; but my judgment is that a commanding officer who stated that he would not receive an application for discharge or for any other reason would be subjecting himself to severe military punishment.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, can the Senator see any justification now for working men on the building of roads alongside of men who are employed at very high wages?

Mr. WEEKS. I not only can not see any justification for it, but I can see every reason why it should not be done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there further concurrent or other resolutions? [A pause.] The morning business is closed.

POST OFFICE APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the unfinished business, the Post Office appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13308) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, I should like the attention of the Senator from Alabama. I now offer the amendment which was read and explained last night, which simply provides, where State constitutions have to be amended, that the part which could not otherwise be used shall be set aside in the Treasury.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I have examined that amendment very carefully, and so have other members of the committee. I think it is very important, and I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should like to have the amendment read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. After the word "act," in line 13, on page 37, it is proposed to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That where the constitution of any State prohibits the same from engaging upon internal improvements, or from contracting public debts for extraordinary purposes in an amount sufficient to meet the monetary requirements of the act of July 11, 1916, or any act amendatory thereof, or restricts annual tax levies for the purpose of constructing and improving roads and bridges, and where a constitutional alteration or amendment to overcome either or all of such prohibitions must be submitted to a referendum at a general election, the sum to which such State is entitled under the method of apportionment provided in the act of July 11, 1916, or any act amendatory thereof, shall be withdrawn by the Secretary of the Treasury from the principal fund appropriated by the act of July 11, 1916, or any act amendatory thereof, upon receipt of the certification of the governor of such State to the existence of either or all of said prohibitions, and such sum shall be carried by the Secretary of the Treasury as a separate fund for future disbursement as hereinafter provided: *Provided further*, That when, by referendum, the constitutional alterations or amendments necessary to the enjoyment of the sum so withdrawn have been approved and ratified by any State, the Secretary of the Treasury, upon receipt of certification from the governor of such State to such effect, shall immediately make available to such State, for the purposes set forth in the act of July 11, 1916, or any act amendatory thereof, the sum withdrawn as hereinbefore provided: *And provided further*, That nothing herein shall be deemed to prevent any State from receiving such portion of said principal sum as is available under its existing constitution and laws.

Mr. KELLOGG obtained the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. KELLOGG. I should like a vote on this amendment, if there is no objection to it, and I do not understand that there is.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I shall be compelled to make a point of order against this amendment. It engrafts general legislation upon an appropriation bill.

Mr. KELLOGG. I hope the Senator will not do that. It does not affect the appropriation in the least. It does not bear on the question of the amount, and, if the appropriation is going

to be made, all the States ought to have a right to take advantage of it. I yield, however, to the Senator from California.

Mr. THOMAS. Just a word, Mr. President. I do not want to do anything that is disagreeable to the Senator, but our rules certainly mean something, and we are becoming prone not only to an occasional but to a constant change of the spirit as well as the letter of our bills by amendments which are not germane to them. Complaint was made last night, and justly so, by the Senator having charge of this bill that it has been four days before the Senate and we have not made much progress upon it. That is due to the fact that it has been transformed by amendments from a Post Office appropriation bill to a good-roads bill. If it were not for the amendment it would have been passed long ago.

Mr. President, I have in my hand a copy of the revenue bill, consisting of some 360 pages. The Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] will probably remember that a few days ago he asked the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] where the money was coming from to meet these expenditures. This is the answer. The Senator said the Finance Committee will attend to that. We have tried to attend to it, but even here appears an appropriation. We can not even pass a revenue bill without appropriating some of the money in advance. We provide here for paying the discharged soldiers \$60 apiece, or \$400,000,000. That is an amendment to a revenue bill. Congress is discounting its own bills 6½ per cent, and I understand that it would have been difficult to secure its enactment but for something of that sort.

There is no question but that the Senator's amendment will improve this bill; but it is new legislation, and certainly we must somewhere, at some time, terminate this constant practice of transforming bills of all sorts into appropriation bills through general legislation. This does not increase the appropriation, but it certainly changes the form of the bill by engrafting general legislation upon it.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I am in full accord with every word the Senator from Colorado has just said. Of course I do not like this road appropriation upon this bill, but I ask the Senator from Colorado to withhold the point of order because—

Mr. THOMAS. I will do that. I will withhold it, of course, but I will not promise not to renew it.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like even to ask the Senator not to renew it, because if this appropriation is made I certainly want it as far as it is possible to be, and the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota is nothing but fair to the different States of the country. I hope the Senator will finally conclude not to press the point of order.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. If the Senator will permit me, I have perhaps already made myself more obnoxious than is personally desirable. I do not care to do so any more than is absolutely necessary. If the Senator from Utah says this is an improvement to the bill I will withdraw the point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG] to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

AMERICAN TROOPS IN RUSSIA.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, I move that the pending measure be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate take up and consider Senate resolution 411.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from California.

Mr. BORAH. Upon that I call for the yeas and nays.

Mr. THOMAS. What was the motion?

The VICE PRESIDENT. To lay aside the appropriation bill and proceed to the consideration of Senate resolution 411, upon which the yeas and nays have been requested.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DILLINGHAM (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH]. I do not see him in the chamber and I withhold my vote.

Mr. KNOX (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN]. I am informed by his colleague that if present he would vote "yea." I will therefore vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. MOSES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MARTIN]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. MYERS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN]. I

observe that he is not present. I transfer my pair to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL] and vote "nay."

Mr. WOLCOTT (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON]. I am unable to secure a transfer and I withhold my vote. If permitted to vote I would vote "nay."

The roll call having been concluded,

Mr. SAULSBURY. I desire to announce the necessary absence from the Chamber of the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] because of illness, and also of the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] for the same cause.

Mr. KENDRICK. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] to the senior Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] and vote "nay."

Mr. FLETCHER. I have a pair with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS]. In his absence I transfer that pair to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and vote "nay."

Mr. SAULSBURY (after having voted in the negative). Has the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I will have to withdraw my vote, having a pair with that Senator.

Mr. PENROSE (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]. I note that he has not voted. I will transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi to the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] and permit my vote to stand.

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce the absence of the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] on business of the Senate.

Mr. MOSES. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MARTIN] to the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] and vote "yea."

Mr. WOLCOTT. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] and I am at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS];

The Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY];

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN]; and

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED].

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 37, not voting 27, as follows:

YEAS—32.			
Ashurst	Harding	La Follette	Penrose
Baird	Hardwick	Lenroot	Sherman
Borah	Johnson, Cal.	Lodge	Smoot
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	McNary	Spencer
Curtis	Kellogg	McNary	Sutherland
France	Kenyon	Moses	Vardaman
Frelinghuysen	Kirby	New	Wadsworth
Gronna	Knox	Page	Warren
NAYS—37.			
Bankhead	King	Pollock	Swanson
Beckham	Lewis	Pomerene	Thomas
Culberson	McKellar	Robinson	Thompson
Fletcher	Martin, Va.	Shafroth	Trammell
Gay	Myers	Sheppard	Underwood
Henderson	Nelson	Simmons	Walsh
Hollis	Nugent	Smith, Ariz.	Wolcott
Johnson, S. Dak.	Overman	Smith, Ga.	
Jones, N. Mex.	Pittman	Smith, S. C.	
Kendrick	Poinindexer	Sterling	
NOT VOTING—27.			
Brandegee	Gerry	Norris	Smith, Md.
Calder	Goff	Owen	Smith, Mich.
Chamberlain	Gore	Phelan	Townsend
Colt	Hale	Ransdell	Watson
Dillingham	Hitchcock	Reed	Weeks
Fall	McLean	Saulsbury	Williams
Fernald	Martin, Ky.	Shields	

So the motion of Mr. JOHNSON of California was rejected.

POST OFFICE APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13308) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, on page 37, line 10, after the numerals "1920," I move to strike out down to and including the numerals "1921," in line 11, in the following words:

And the sum of \$75,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921.

The effect of that amendment will be to reduce the appropriation \$75,000,000, but it applies only to the appropriation for the

fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, or, in other words, it provides that at this time Congress shall not authorize an appropriation of \$75,000,000, which under this amendment, if it becomes a law, may not be expended until the year 1924.

There is no necessity whatever to appropriate money now that may not be used before the year 1924, and as a matter of wisdom and policy it should not be done. The next Congress or the Congress following can appropriate the money just as well as not to carry on this work, and by that time Congress will know more about the requirements of the Government; everyone in the country will know whether the conditions are such that the money ought to be expended for this purpose.

In saying this, Mr. President, I want it distinctly understood that I believe in the building of good roads. I believe that that is one of the most important questions before the American people to-day, and I think millions and billions of dollars could be expended in the building of these roads; but let us at least use a little judgment in appropriating money out of the Treasury of the United States to be expended, perhaps, not before three or four years hence, and when we know nothing about the conditions which will exist in the country at that time. It is unwise, it is uncalled for, and it should not be done.

Again, Mr. President, I believe whatever amount of money is to be appropriated, if any is appropriated by this bill, should be for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919. As far as I am concerned, if the money is to be appropriated, I would rather see the \$50,000,000 taken from the next appropriation, that would be for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and added to the fiscal year 1919.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator permit me to ask a question for my own information?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. KING. I should like to know what appropriation was made for 1919 and how much has been expended?

Mr. SMOOT. The appropriations that have already been made amounted to \$75,000,000, and this bill provides \$50,000,000 more for the present fiscal year. I think very little of the \$75,000,000 that was appropriated three years ago is expended.

Mr. KING. It was my understanding that the amount appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, has scarcely been touched and that most of it is still available.

Mr. SMOOT. There is some of it available. But I will say, that the \$50,000,000 that is provided for in the bill for the present fiscal year is immediately available and could be expended for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919.

Mr. KING. I understand that, but I was not sure about the other.

Mr. SMOOT. Under the existing law, if the States do not avail themselves of this \$50,000,000 by June 30, 1919, they have another additional year to do so; and as we want the appropriations, if they are made, to be such as to give employment to the people of this country at as early a date as possible, I believe that whatever appropriation is made ought to be made in the first instance for the year ending June 30, 1919.

All that was said yesterday upon this question could be repeated to-day, but there is no necessity for it. I wish that we could have Senators in their seats to listen to the discussion of these questions and know why the amendments are made.

Mr. President, if I stood here on the floor and spoke for an hour it would make no special difference as to the vote that will be taken, but I do want a record vote on this particular amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. Does the Senator mean the section?

Mr. SMOOT. No; the amendment I have just offered to strike out \$75,000,000. I hope the amendment that I have just offered to the amendment of the committee will be agreed to.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, in road construction it is necessary to have the plans several years ahead. The idea is to fix up a good system of road construction and improvement, and the engineers must lay it out. They must be connected with other roads, and unless you have a plan three or four years ahead, it is disconnected and not as systematic as it is with a three years' program. That is the reason why the committee decided that it was better to have a three years' program, so that it could be fixed up systematically and so that the engineers and the department could have a systematic system devised.

Mr. LENROOT. If the Senator will yield, I should like to ask him a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POMERENE in the chair). Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. SWANSON. I yield.

Mr. LENROOT. I should like to ask the Senator where he thinks the money is coming from to pay this bill?

Mr. SWANSON. I am satisfied the Government will have plenty of money; but even if we must economize in other things—even if it is necessary to continue taxation—there is nothing that will add more to the wealth and more to the power of the country and more to the comfort of the people than road construction. It is an investment; it is not waste. It is not an expenditure of useless money. I believe there is nothing the Government could do—

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

Mr. SWANSON. I will yield in a minute. There is nothing the Government could do that would be more beneficial and bring a better return than appropriations and expenditures made for road improvement. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. One remark the Senator made has interested me. Will he please indicate where we can economize in other things?

Mr. SWANSON. As soon as all the expenses of the war are over, with the increase of wealth, when we get down to an economical basis, I am satisfied that the Government can have a tax system that will carry road improvement without being onerous.

Mr. THOMAS. That is a very general answer to a specific question.

Mr. SWANSON. If there is anything the Government can spend money for that brings good returns, that brings good profits, that adds to the comfort of the people, it is road improvement.

Mr. THOMAS. If I may ask the Senator from Virginia another question, is the Senator going to support the proposed increase of the Navy involving an expenditure of \$700,000,000?

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator is entirely mistaken about the naval bill. The naval bill now pending in the House, as I understand, providing for the additional naval program, appropriates about \$400,000,000 approximately, the expenditure to extend over five or six years. The entire appropriation, as I understand, for this year is about \$750,000,000. A great deal of it is temporary, on account of the change to a peace basis from a war basis.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator from Virginia has not yet answered my question. Who will cut the appropriation down from \$700,000,000 to \$400,000,000? But I merely ask the Senator does he expect to support the bill?

Mr. SWANSON. I expect to support it should the condition be such that there is no disarmament or cessation of navalism in other countries. In that event, in order to save this country, we should have a Navy adequate to protect our great commercial interests and our liberty and our institutions.

Mr. THOMAS. Is the Senator in favor of reducing the appropriation?

Mr. SWANSON. I will discuss the naval bill when it comes here.

Mr. THOMAS. I understand that; but the Senator stated that we ought to economize in some other direction; and I am in favor of economizing both in other directions and here. I was anxious to ascertain, if I could, from the Senator where we could begin this work of economy. That is the thing I have been hunting for the six years I have been in the Senate, but I can not find it.

Mr. SWANSON. I understand the naval appropriation bill has been reduced a great deal in the expenditure which it carries.

Mr. THOMAS. It has been reduced from \$1,250,000,000 to \$700,000,000, I understand.

Mr. SWANSON. It has been reduced a great deal more than that, and it has also been reduced from the estimates about two or three hundred million dollars. The appropriation is temporary on account of the changed conditions from war to peace. I have not examined the naval bill in detail so as to speak explicitly regarding it. I simply have the general impression. The bill has not yet come over to the Senate.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I regard the third year of this appropriation as the most important of any year provided for in the bill. The department which is to put this bill into force and execution also holds that view. Why? If we are going to enter upon an extensive program of road construction in this country, it must be systematically entered upon, planned, and surveyed, and estimates must be made. State constitutions must be amended in some particulars. We have already authorized that in this bill, in order that all of the States may enjoy that portion of the appropriation to which they are entitled. The third year in this bill, as I have repeatedly said, is the most important of any. States have got to make their plans; they have got to make their surveys and estimates; they have got to provide for raising revenue. Many

States perhaps would hesitate about extensive preparations to be made to match the provisions in this bill if they were only to be applied or extended for two years.

The money which is to be appropriated will not be expended until the third year. The Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] says it is carried over to 1924, but he is mistaken.

Mr. SMOOT. I said it could be carried over.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not see how. There is nothing in the bill which authorizes it.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not think the Senator wants to make that statement.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do make it.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator allow me to call his attention to what the bill provides?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will read from the bill. Let us see what the bill says.

Mr. SMOOT. Let me call attention to what the bill says. I think I can find it in a moment.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I will read that portion of the bill to which I have referred, and that portion of the bill has not been amended. It was proposed to amend it, but the amendment went out on a point of order made by the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING]. So the original law as passed in 1916 is the law that controls this appropriation.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I desire to say that I had the amendment here before me this morning when I was speaking.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I thought that had misled the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. I was speaking to the amendment that I had before me.

Mr. BANKHEAD. But that went out; that is not in the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. That amendment provided for the extension of the appropriation two years instead of one year, as in the existing law.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That went out, and is not in the bill. I hope the Senate will carefully consider this matter. There is no economy—in fact, it is a waste, to my mind, to strike out the third-year provision of this proposed law. The States can not possibly make their arrangements economically and wisely to enter upon this extensive system of road improvement unless they have time in which to make their plans, their financial and other arrangements. If you cut them off right at the beginning of the third year, what happens? They have gone on for two years under the provisions of the law; they have entered upon road construction. Everybody, I think, understands how much interested the people of this country are in the question of improved roads and improved means of transportation from the farms to the depots and river landings and finally to the consumer. I do not think anybody need apprehend that under any circumstances we are to be criticized for liberal appropriations for this purpose.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Will the Senator let me ask him a question?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. What amount under this bill will be immediately available?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Under this bill the amount which will be immediately available, according to the figures of the Secretary of Agriculture, who recommends this appropriation, is as follows: There will be immediately available for this fiscal year, under the provisions of this law, \$170,000,000. Why? Because \$70,000,000 of former appropriations have not been applied; the States have not made their plans and accepted the provisions of the law. Therefore that amount of money for two years remains unexpended because of war conditions, as the Secretary of Agriculture states. The plans were all adopted and approved, but the construction was held up on account of war conditions. Material could not be shipped, labor could not be obtained, and therefore road building during the last year or two, during the years which the war was going on, was practically suspended.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Then there is \$170,000,000 immediately available?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If it will not interrupt the Senator, I should be glad to call his attention to the fact that a series of hearings have been going on before the Committee on Education and Labor upon a bill looking toward quite liberal appropriations to meet by employment on public works the threatened lack of employment in different parts of the country. The committee adjourned this morning, after another long hearing, without definite action; but we adjourned with the understanding that we would see how far this bill would provide authority to the use at certain places, perhaps, of part of this appropriation, even before it was met by the State. Could anything be done

without embarrassing or hindering this bill to facilitate the very prompt use of this fund where the lack of occupation for labor made it especially important?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not think it would be wise to undertake to inject a provision of that kind into this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The bill pending before the Committee on Education and Labor carries an appropriation of \$100,000,000, to be used by a board to be designated in the bill, to meet, by providing employment on public works, conditions that may very possibly arise, and which I think we ought seriously to consider.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will say to the Senator that I think \$170,000,000, as provided in this bill, will be ample to meet that suggestion.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I want to add that it must not be overlooked that one-half of this money is to be paid by the States.

Mr. KENYON. One-half of the \$170,000,000?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. KENYON. I wish to get right down to the question which the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] has suggested. Can this work go on in the next few months? That is when this labor trouble is coming, and I am looking at it from that standpoint.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It can begin to-morrow, and, in fact, has already begun.

Mr. KENYON. It is necessary to have the States take some action in the matter, is it not?

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; not many of the States will have to act, although some few will. I have just stated that the Secretary of Agriculture in his letter says that a very large number of these applications on the part of States have been approved, but have been held up on account of war conditions. They could not get the material; they could not get the labor. Now they are ready to go right to work and the money is ready under the old appropriation for these approved contracts.

Mr. KENYON. How many men actually can be put to work, does the Senator know?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not know; but I will say that there are 391 projects already under agreement, where the States are ready to put up their share and the Government is ready to put up its share. That work will go on now because the conditions are such that it can be proceeded with. If we pass this bill labor can be obtained and the materials necessary to the building of roads can be obtained, because the railroad conditions have changed.

Mr. KENYON. How extensive are those projects? Are they large projects?

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; not very many of them are. They are all in their nature local to the various counties and States.

Mr. KENYON. Can the Senator give any estimate of how many men will perhaps be employed on those projects?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I have no definite figures as to that; but I would say unhesitatingly that under this bill, providing for an expenditure this fiscal year of \$170,000,000, at least 500,000 men, and perhaps more, can be employed on these roads. The benefit of these provisions is that the soldiers who are returning without employment are going to every State in this Union. They are not going to be discharged and remain in the cities of the East, but they are going back to the States where they enlisted, and they will be there trying to get employment. Under the provisions of this bill men who go back to Alabama or to Wisconsin or to any other State in the Union will be there ready to accept employment at liberal wages when this road construction begins, and it has already begun. As I have stated, 391 projects have been approved, and they are ready to proceed with the work. That is the benefit that will come from this bill.

I desire to repeat before I sit down that the provision of this bill as to the third year is the most important of all. If the provision for the third year is stricken out, the plans can not be made, the financial arrangements can not be made, and the State constitutions can not be amended, as some of them must be amended. This money will remain in the Treasury until the fiscal year for which it is appropriated; not a dollar of it can be expended until the time comes; and I hope the Senate will not consider for a moment the motion of the Senator from Utah to strike out the most important, to my mind the vital, provision of this bill. We had better strike out the first section.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The feature of this bill that appeals greatly to some of us is the first year's work, the work that can be done now. If the Senator had heard the testimony that has been presented to the Committee on Education and Labor, I believe he would be aroused to the necessity of furnishing work during the next six months to a great number of men who will otherwise be out of work.

Mr. BANKHEAD. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It was suggested at our committee meetings that this bill in the provision for the first year's work would go far toward meeting this necessity. If I could, I would take the appropriation for the last year and add it to the first year, double it now, so as to be sure that we were taking steps which would give an opportunity to furnish occupation to labor where disorganization has arisen, their country having taken the men away from their homes and their occupations by the draft and put them in the Army.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President—

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Will the Senator allow me to say just a word more?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. We feared that they would be kept at the front all this year; but, thank God, they do not have to stay there, and now that the war is over let us not fail to realize that a duty rests upon us to provide for them as they come home by furnishing an opportunity to work along lines provided for in this bill. I think the opportunity is at least partially presented by this bill; I think they can do a great public service; they can accomplish results beneficial to the entire country, and at the same time we can meet our obligation to see that there is a chance for occupation to the men returning home whom we broke up their former relations to civil life.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I entirely agree with the suggestions made by the Senator from Georgia. I could not tell, in response to the question of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], exactly how many men could be employed on road construction under the provisions of the bill for the first year, but there could certainly be employed a great number of men with the amount of money provided. The beauty of it is, Mr. President, that employment will be provided for them in every State in the Union. We are not proposing to go to New York or Philadelphia or Chicago or Boston to spend large amounts of money to give employment to the unemployed, but we are going out to every section of the country, in every State and every county where these men have returned after their discharge from the Army.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me a moment?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. SWANSON. It is estimated that over 50 per cent of expenditures for roads go directly to labor. The character of labor employed in such work, outside of the skilled engineers and road constructors, is not skilled labor, but is the usual kind of labor that in times of distress needs occupation and employment more than any other. If any measure could be devised to give occupation to the character of people who will be out of employment, road construction is generally understood to be the best kind of work for that purpose. It takes care of a class of people who are out of employment, and, in addition to that, the work is of permanent and lasting benefit.

Mr. THOMAS and Mr. SMOOT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. THOMAS. I thought the Senator had yielded the floor.

Mr. SWANSON. Not yet. As to the amount to be expended for the first year, there was some suggestion that the Senator from Alabama had exaggerated the figures. The estimate here is \$170,000,000, as he stated; that is, \$50,000,000 of Federal appropriations, to be supplemented by a like amount from the States, making \$100,000,000, to which should be added the balance now available from former and present fiscal years from State and Federal sources, amounting to \$70,000,000, making the total amount for the first year \$170,000,000.

Mr. THOMAS obtained the floor.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the statement has been made that 500,000 men could be given employment under the first year's appropriation. I wish to call attention to the inaccuracy of that statement. Granting that \$170,000,000 will be available the first year, if the men engaged on road building are paid \$1,000 a year on the average, that would mean employment for 170,000 men. But it is admitted that only half of the amount goes to labor and that the other half is applied

to other expenses, so the most that could be employed would be 85,000.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Does the Senator object to the appropriation on that account?

Mr. SMOOT. No; I am only correcting the record; that is all.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I stated that I did not have the exact figures and did not know exactly the number of men who could be employed.

Mr. SMOOT. So that instead of 500,000 men who could be employed the first year, there would be about 85,000.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I presume the Senator from Utah has figured out how many men can be employed. I did not do that, and did not have the opportunity to do so.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Does the Senator from Utah wish to enlarge the appropriation, so that it will give employment to 500,000 men?

Mr. SMOOT. I would rather do that for the first year than to appropriate money for the third year, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. VARDAMAN. There are two interests to be subserved—the people living in the country, who use the roads, and the people who are given employment in building the roads. If you can serve the country better by making a part of the appropriation available the third year, it seems to me there ought not to be any objection; not, I submit, because it may not give employment to quite so many men in the first year. We wish to serve the soldiers who will return to their homes without employment, but we also wish to serve the men and women whose labor produces the materials that feed and clothe the world, pay the taxes, and support the Government. In other words, I am interested in taking care of the farmers, whom I consider the substratum of all national prosperity.

Mr. SMOOT. I say that when the third year comes, and long before it comes, Congress will know whether they want to appropriate \$75,000,000 or \$150,000,000, or whether they are bankrupt, so that they can not appropriate anything. That is all.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I have observed that many of the appropriations which are sought for find their excuse in the assertion that the money is needed to secure employment for returning soldiers. We are regaled here every morning, or some part of every day, by complaints that men who have jobs and want to fill them can not secure their discharges. We are told that jobs are hungering for returning soldiers, and the department is seriously criticized and sometimes denounced because those who desire discharges to return to employment can not secure them.

Mr. President, I was 15 years old when the Civil War ended. The press of the country at that time called attention to the reluctance of a great many discharged soldiers to work at all, to return to their ancient employments, or to renew the more prosaic and less attractive forms of civil pursuits; and that was true. It is an unfortunate fact that war begets the lust of adventure and of excitement and of restlessness in the blood of the young men who serve their country. It is difficult for them to lapse back into the lives which they led prior to the beginning of conflict.

I noticed a day or two ago in a New York paper that among the unemployed in New York were 15,000 discharged soldiers, most of them farm boys, who had determined thereafter to live in New York City. I am told by men engaged in the work of mustering out the soldiers that there is a widespread spirit of wanderlust, especially among the farm boys—and it is human nature; we can not blame them—who are not disposed to return to their ordinary pursuits, to the humdrum toil of life. They have got a taste of the world's excitement, and they desire to enjoy more of it.

A gentleman perfectly competent to speak said in my presence the other day that the colored soldiers of the South were on the streets of the cities, wearing their uniforms; that they did not want to work. Of course, that does not include all of them; but they felt—and there, again, it is a natural feeling—that having served their country, and served it well, they are now entitled to the enjoyment of a different life; and, of course, we are encouraging that by all sorts of proposed legislation. I have called attention to the fact that we could not even pass a revenue bill without providing for an appropriation of \$400,000,000 for extra pay.

A young citizen of my city came to see me within the week. He said he wanted to get his discharge as soon as possible because his old job was awaiting him. I told him that I had been informed that in my own city of Denver there were 7,000 to 10,000 soldiers looking for jobs. He said, "No; I have just come from there. They are not looking for jobs; they want

positions." He said, "There are plenty of jobs." And I know that the farms of this country are literally crying for help.

There are from 60,000 to 80,000 men on strike in the cities of Seattle and Tacoma. There are jobs that can be filled by returning soldiers, and ought to be. We may perhaps find ourselves in the position, I will not say of encouraging but of sympathizing, with organized strikes in the country while at the same time voting millions upon millions of dollars of the people's money to secure jobs for returning soldiers. I think that our principal task is going to be to find soldiers for jobs rather than to find jobs for soldiers.

I am not reflecting upon the patriotism or the enterprise of the young soldier. I am speaking, of course, of an exception to the general class; but it is wrong, Mr. President, to use the argument of a desire to give jobs to thousands of people for the purpose of getting these enormous appropriations out of a depleted Treasury.

Mr. President, the man whom God helps is the man who helps himself; and once we begin this paternal, charitable system of legislation, I do not know where we are going to end it. I contend that the men who stayed at home and who are detailed to work at home, in the city of Washington and in other cities, in carrying out that necessary supplemental task of supplying the Army with its sinews and with its supplies, are just as much entitled to appropriations, that we may now find them jobs, as others. The jobs, Mr. President, are here. The country wants every man. It can find a job for every man who wants a job; but we propose to say to these gentlemen, "We will get you jobs"; and a man who depends upon a condition of that kind for a job, and who accepts it, expects extraordinary consideration.

I have already called attention, in another argument that I presented to the Senate, to the extraordinary fact that under the provisions of this bill specific preference is given to soldiers and sailors, which is class legislation, which provides that the man who pays the taxes must be subordinated to the man who does not pay the taxes in the enjoyment of their expenditure.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. Just a moment. This should stand upon its merits. If the country needs and should have \$200,000,000, let us vote it; but do not let us camouflage our proposed appropriation by saying that it is necessary to give jobs to free, independent American citizens in a country of opportunity, where every man who wants to make a living and to earn it has abundant opportunity to do so.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. KENYON. I think possibly the Senator has answered the question I intended to ask. It was this: Does the Senator believe that there is plenty of opportunity for work and plenty of work and plenty of jobs for those who are seeking them in the country?

Mr. THOMAS. As far as I am able to judge, yes. There are no jobs in New York City for 15,000 men who do not belong there and who will not go home.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Will they not go home?

Mr. THOMAS. No; the newspapers state that they intend to make their future homes in these great cities.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Let me ask the Senator a question.

Mr. THOMAS. I can answer only one question at a time.

Mr. KENYON. Let me get through with mine. The Senator differs with the Labor Department of the Government with respect to this matter. Now, I agree with the Senator that this proposition of getting work for returned soldiers and all that is being made the vehicle to get great appropriations through.

Mr. THOMAS. There is no doubt in the world about it.

Mr. KENYON. That is true; and I do not believe in it at all; but I should like to think the Senator is correct in his view of the labor situation. The Department of Labor, in this testimony of which the Senator from Georgia speaks, has shown to that committee, by reports from the various cities—and I leave out this Seattle question and all of these strike questions—that the ratio of unemployment has been going up at a very alarming figure. There are not so many unemployed now as to be at all startling, but the ratio of unemployment is startling. For instance, we learn from reports from these centers that on December 13 there were 10,000 unemployed. That has gone up this week to 264,000, and they say there is not a job for every man seeking a job.

The holding back of investment, the holding back of building that has gone on during the war, has had something to do with

this situation. Men are not going ahead with building because material is so high and labor is high, and that situation has arisen in the country. I think it is a very troublesome situation. There have been held back by municipalities and States some three hundred millions of public works that already have been authorized. There is a great deal of Government work that has been authorized. Now, if we could go ahead with that, it would not make more public buildings, for instance, but the effort would be concentrated where the unemployment exists. Does the Senator feel that everything is all right; that there is no need along this line?

Mr. THOMAS. No; nothing is all right in this country at all times. If it were there would be nothing to live for. The Labor Department knows, and ought to know, much more about this situation than I do; but I know that in the city of New York, where there is a large amount of unemployment, there are also big strikes going on. Nobody wants to take the place of a striker. We all know, too, that the Labor Department is officered by those representing one species of labor, and that, as far as possible, the unemployed must, or is expected to, at least, identify himself with the organizations in order to get work through this board. I do not mean to say that that is universal; but, if my information is correct, it has characterized the operations of the board in some places.

But, Mr. President, I am satisfied—and this is not peculiar to this war; it is history; it is common experience; it is taking place in Great Britain, in Australia, in Canada, just as it is here; it is human nature—that men who have gone through the terrible and at the same time fascinating excitements of the war are reluctant, many of them, to reassume their civic duties and fill their old positions. I think in every city in the Union there are aggregations of men who have recently been in the Army who want jobs in the cities, while the country is crying and clamoring for help.

Mr. KENYON. There is no doubt about the country crying and clamoring for help.

Mr. THOMAS. And that the congestion in the cities is followed by starvation in the country. The problem before that board and before Congress is to induce men to go back to their old jobs, to go to farming, to go to blacksmithing, and so forth, instead of rushing into these cities and wasting their time in looking for jobs and attending the cheap theaters and other attractions of the cities.

Mr. KENYON. That is true; but, in the words of a great man whom the Senator did not think was a Democrat, it is a condition and not a theory that confronts us right now.

Mr. THOMAS. I know he was not a Democrat. I want to relieve the condition. I do not believe this will do it, however.

Mr. KENYON. I do not know. I hope the Senator is right when he says that there is a job for every man. I am afraid there is not, however.

Mr. THOMAS. There have been times, of course, when that was not the case, and there may be times now when that is not the case. I am willing to concede that; but is this the right sort of remedy?

Mr. KENYON. I do not know. What is the remedy? If there is not some remedy in carrying on public works, what is the remedy? The remedy is not to make speeches about it.

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, making speeches is a remedy for nothing, especially in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. KENYON. That is the only way we remedy anything here, so far as I know.

Mr. THOMAS. Unfortunately, that is the only way in which we transact business here. The other House votes, and does not talk. We talk, and never vote; and, of course, I am just as guilty as anybody else, so far as that is concerned. It is difficult to outline the remedy at once; but I say primarily the remedy is to ascertain where jobs are—not who wants them so much as where jobs are. Let these employees ask the farmers of Iowa, the farmers and miners of Colorado—I know that there are mines in my State that need skilled men—and by that means ascertaining the job, then bring the man who is without it to that job, instead of, upon the assumption that we are catering to a greatly needed want, taking two hundred millions out of the Treasury of the United States for the purpose of making the people of our different States feel so much better because Uncle Sam's money is going to be distributed among them.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question at that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. THOMAS. I wanted to yield the floor some time ago.

Mr. VARDAMAN. The learned Senator from Colorado always talks interestingly.

Mr. THOMAS. Interestingly and too much.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Interestingly and instructively. No; the Senator from Colorado can not talk too much to suit me. But I would like to suggest this thought, which has occurred to me and which I hope may throw some light on the subject. Primarily the purpose of this appropriation is not to give jobs.

Mr. THOMAS. No; but that is the argument upon which it is based, that it is needed at this time.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Of course, the honorable Senator from Colorado will not be carried off upon that idea. The appropriation is to build roads for the convenience and benefit of the people who live in the rural districts and for the convenience of the country generally. Good roads will cheapen the freight rates, the cost of carrying the products of the farms to market; good roads will facilitate social intercourse among the people, which will also enhance the value of the land and work for better living in the country in every way; good roads will improve the social life of the men and women who have to bear the burdens and the expense of government. Now, if you wish to make country life more attractive, if you would draw from the city to the farm men and women, if you would keep the boys reared in the country on the farm, you have got to make it possible for the farmer to visit his neighbor, to send his children to school, to carry his goods to market, and that will be made possible only by the building of good highways. You have got to bring him into the world, out of his heretofore forced isolation. I think the best investment this Government ever made, one that brings the largest returns to all the people, is the money invested in good highways, because, as stated above, good highways mean good schools; good highways mean better churches; good highways mean better live stock and improved farming implements; good highways improve educational facilities and elevate the moral tone of the community and in every way work for the upbuilding and betterment of society. They make farm life attractive when nothing else will, keep the boys from leaving the farm to go to the city, where they are often engulfed in the maelstrom of immorality and idleness. And I want to say, Mr. President, in conclusion, that when you benefit the agricultural element of this country you improve every other class of society, and you can not benefit one neighborhood in the United States or neglect the interests of one neighborhood without benefiting or injuring the entire Republic.

It is my judgment that the greater part of this money that is going to be spent on the roads will be paid to men now living in the country and soldiers who will return from the Army to the farm. Farmers in all probability will do the greater part of the road work. I do not indulge the hope that you are going to be able to induce people resident in the city to go to the country to do this road-building work. I hope they may go there. The work is healthy, moderate, and the remuneration will be ample, and the man who fails to take advantage of the opportunity thus furnished for employment, and remains idle in town, will prove himself to be an undesirable citizen.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator has repeated the argument that was made when this bill was presented by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON]. I referred to that the other day. There is a great deal in it. It is the argument which carried \$75,000,000 through the Senate and the House two years ago, a great part of which is not yet spent.

Of course, good roads are beneficial, but the Senator has not mentioned one thing which this and other appropriations are going to bring to the people, and that is bankruptcy, which, in my mind, is a poor equivalent for the benefits to which the Senator has referred.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I do not think it will bring bankruptcy. I think this appropriation for roads is a good investment.

Mr. THOMAS. Of course, this bill is only one of a number. The total appropriations to be made, pending, and which will be pending during the short life of this Congress will amount to thousands of millions of dollars; and there is just as much basis for the other appropriations at this time as there is for this one. Good roads have \$75,000,000 at this time, and ought not to be enriched by \$200,000,000, however desirable the benefits that will grow from it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, before I make any remarks upon this amendment, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee whether he knows if it is to be the policy of the Southern States to continue the employment of convicts in the States on these roads which are to be built by the Federal Government?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not know of any State of the South that has ever employed State convicts.

Mr. THOMAS. My State employs them, and I hope it will continue to employ them.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I hope so, too.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That has nothing to do with this question. Do they employ convicts on the roads in the Senator's State?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Yes; and that simply brings out the point I want to make in my opposition to this amendment. I think this talk about employing the returned soldiers on the roads is foolishness. In the first place, I do not believe any number of soldiers will be willing to go on the roads and work under the conditions which are demanded. These soldiers have returned from France where they have been under the care of the Government, and be it said to the credit of the War Department they have been well rationed. If they are to accept employment from the Government, or whoever contracts to build these roads, they must submit not to the military rations or fare but to the fare provided by the contractor, and he is going to make as much money out of the contract as he can. Consequently the living conditions and the food will not be of the same standard that the soldiers enjoyed while in the Army. Besides, it will compel the soldiers to go out to live in bunk houses, many of them under uncomfortable conditions, far from home, and what the soldier wants now is to go home and work near his home.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Does the Senator understand that this provision compels the soldiers to work on the roads?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. No; I understand that it does not; that it is voluntary, but I say—

Mr. BANKHEAD. If they do not want to go there and live in bunk houses, they will not go.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I say to the chairman of the committee the conditions are such that it will not be attractive to those men. They want to go home and work near their homes. Many of those men have homes, and you can not take them on these roads and induce them in any wise to take that kind of employment.

Mr. President, I am perfectly willing to support any bill which will enable us to employ idle men in this country, but the reason why men are idle to-day is because the manufacturers can not pay the present rate of wages. They can not sell their goods at the present rate of wages, and they are compelled to shut down their industries. Besides that, the manufacturers of this country are unwilling to take any chances in buying raw material or engaging in any future contracts under the present system of taxation. They are afraid to take a chance as to the future.

That brings me to the point I want to make in regard to this bill. I do not want to oppose any measure which will give the States of the Union which have a small mileage of roads an increase mileage through any aid whether State or Federal. Good roads are probably the only medium through which the farming sections of the country and the productive areas of the country can be built up. I think my State alone has had a wider experience in regard to that, for we were the pioneer State in road building. Twenty years ago the State-road act was passed whereby the State aided the counties and the townships in building roads, and it brought great prosperity to the State. I think we were the first State which adopted that plan.

I believe it is a question of grave doubt whether the Federal Government should continue the paternalistic policy of these public improvements for the benefit of the States. There is not enough money in the Treasury to continue these tremendous appropriations. We have engaged in the extension of vocational education, and we passed the farm-demonstration act—I think it is the Smith-Lever Act—all of great benefit to the States and all needed; but the question now arises just as we are emerging from the war, when we do not know what our war debt is going to be, when we must necessarily raise another liberty loan of \$6,000,000,000, when it is doubtful whether we can raise that loan. On top of that the statement was made by the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot]—I think on yesterday—that in the fiscal year ending June 30 we will need \$10,000,000,000 for governmental expenses. With all that in view I say the time has come, if we are practical, common-sense business men in this Chamber, when we have got to put our feet down on these public enterprises and developments, for a time at least.

The estimates of the Senator from Utah are not all the obligations which the Government will have to meet. I do not think he included in that the billion and a quarter that will be required to keep our faith with the farmers in the \$2.26 additional that we agreed to pay for wheat. It does not include the \$750,000,000 in the naval bill, an appropriation which the President says is vital to the negotiations for peace just as peace is dawning. There is a \$75,000,000 omnibus public-building bill; I understand, pending in the House of Representatives. There will be \$1,000,000,000 required to replace the source of revenue which the Government will be deprived of by reason of the pro-

hibition amendment, and we shall have a fixed charge of \$750,000,000 interest on our war debt.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator is correct in stating that in my estimate, that was made on December 18 last, I did not take into consideration most of the items he has already mentioned, but I may add, if that is all the Senator is going to mention, there are a few more.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. It is practically \$4,000,000,000. In addition to this tremendous amount there are other projects mentioned; \$400,000,000 for the development of the Mississippi and \$500,000,000 for the development of land under Secretary Lane's proposal for returning soldiers.

Mr. President, this has been the most lavish and extravagant era in American history, and just as we are now struggling to recover from the tremendous burdens of taxation imposed by reason of the war Congress is flooded with projects which are paternalistic in nature. If eventually it is to be the policy of the Government, we should have some systematic plan, not a slipshod catch-as-you-can plan, where a few States will benefit by it and other States will fail to benefit by it, but a system properly studied, a system of national highways, trunk lines running from coast to coast, East to West, North to South, so that every State will be equally benefited. If we are to enter upon a policy of Federal road building, that should be the system and method which we should adopt, not this careless method of appropriating to just a few States.

Mr. President, I shall oppose this amendment because I think it is unwise at this time to enlarge the expenditures of the Government and place great burdens of taxation upon the business and manufacturing interests of the country.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator does not oppose my amendment to the amendment?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I will support your amendment because it reduces the appropriation, and I shall then vote against the appropriation of \$200,000,000.

I simply want to read, in closing, from the Democratic Campaign Textbook of 1912 a section of the Democratic platform, entitled "Economy in the public service." The Democratic platform says:

We denounce the profligate waste of the money wrung from the people by oppressive taxation through the lavish appropriations of recent Republican Congresses, which have kept taxes high and reduced the purchasing power of the people's toil. We demand a return to that simplicity and economy which befits a democratic Government, and a reduction in the number of useless offices, the salaries of which drain the substance of the people.

Again, in the Democratic platform of 1916, under the title "Economy and the budget," we find the following:

We demand careful economy in all expenditures for the support of the Government, and to that end favor a return by the House of Representatives to its former practice of initiating and preparing all appropriation bills through a single committee, chosen from its membership, in order that responsibility may be centered, expenditures standardized, and made uniform, and waste and duplication in the public service as much as possible avoided. We favor this as a practicable first step toward a budget system.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, although I have been very much interested in these amendments to the bill, and interested, too, in the discussion, so far I have said nothing in this debate. I wish to say this, Mr. President, that if the Democratic Party has violated its platform, as just read by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], in no other or greater way than it would violate it by standing for the present bill, and for that provision of the bill relating to Federal aid for good roads, I could easily excuse the Democratic Party, for, Mr. President, as I view it, the expenditure contemplated by this bill is not at all wasteful extravagance, the thing which the Democratic Party condemns in its platform, nor is it the paternalistic policy described by the Senator from New Jersey.

Under the broad power given Congress to establish post offices and post roads a great deal more may be done by Congress than merely designating a post-road route by declaring that it shall follow certain lines. The power to establish post offices and post roads must mean the power to construct and maintain also, because, though established, laid out, or defined, without the construction of the road the mere laying out or defining of the road might be wholly unavailing.

With that power, Mr. President, not only to establish a post road, but the power which must necessarily follow, namely, to construct and maintain a road, how much has ever been expended by the Government of the United States in laying out, constructing, or maintaining the post roads of the country?

I am not quite sure that I am correct, but my belief is that never a cent had been expended by the General Government or appropriated by Congress for the purpose of constructing and maintaining the Government post roads throughout the country

until it was appropriated under the bill passed in 1916, the present law. I think it fair and reasonable to ask the question whether the Government, in the construction of these roads, does not itself owe something to the people in the way of aiding in their construction as post roads and for the purpose of the carriage of the mails.

But, as I say, the Government, until the good-roads law in 1916, had never, as I recall, appropriated a cent for the construction or maintenance of its post roads. Under the law, and under the regulations of the Post Office Department made in pursuance of the law, routes have been designated, of course, and every railroad throughout the country is a post route under the law and under the regulations. But the Government has never expended any money in the construction of railroads or in other roads over which the mails have been carried by city or by rural carriage.

Mr. President, I am for this bill and this feature of the bill on the ground that it is not paternalism, and because it is in pursuance of a wise, wide, and beneficent national policy.

What are the ends of Government? I think one of the great ends is the welfare of the people. What is related to the welfare of the people? Their means of social intercourse, anything that may help them from an economic point of view, education, are all things that pertain immediately to the welfare of the people; and what better means of securing these ends, and thereby securing the welfare of the people, than a system of good roads throughout the country?

Mr. President, it is appalling sometimes when we think of the economic waste that arises out of a system of bad roads, the difficulties and the delays in getting the produce of the farmer to the market, the losses which farmers sustain in many sections of the country because of bad roads.

Communities in certain States of this Union are financially unable, because of their situation, because of their newness, because of their population, because of their lack of great industrial interests to help them, to construct a system of good roads, and when the Government lays out the post roads, since it has power and authority to construct and maintain them, it is but reasonable and natural that the people should say to Congress: "Build half of certain of these post roads of yours as they may be laid out, as the projects may be approved by the State highway commissions, and as they may be approved by the Secretary of Agriculture."

Here are the proper safeguards to prevent waste and extravagance, Mr. President, in the expenditure of the money appropriated. You first have the State authorities passing upon the question, determining whether or not the route is feasible, whether it is needed, whether this post road should be made a good travelable, safe road. It is first passed upon by the State authorities, and then again by the Secretary of Agriculture, and after a survey, preliminary at least, of the route over which the road is to be constructed.

So, Mr. President, with this as our policy, with the underlying thought and need being the economic, social, and educational welfare of all the people of the country, why should not Congress appropriate one-half of the amount necessary to build, construct, and maintain some of the roads which the Government uses for the purpose of carrying the mails?

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. STERLING. I yield.

Mr. LENROOT. I am, of course, in full accord generally with all the Senator has stated, but I wish to ask the Senator whether the establishment of post roads is not primarily of local benefit, and when the Federal Government pays the salary of the rural carrier, whether the Government is not contributing to a local benefit?

Mr. STERLING. I agree with the Senator from Wisconsin in the respect that it is primarily of local or community benefit; but, Mr. President, because it does not excuse the Government itself in denying all aid in the construction of these roads.

Let me call attention, in passing, to the situation in my own State as compared with conditions in other States in the Union, with the conditions in those States from which the Senators come who are most strenuous in their opposition to the good-roads part of the bill. These Senators come from States where there is material in abundance for the construction of good roads. In most of the Eastern States, I think, they have the stone, they have the gravel, and they are near industries which produce other elements of material necessary for the construction of good roads. But out in South Dakota, where east of the Missouri River it is like one great farm, with no gravel of consequence, with little other road-building material avail-

able, the people themselves, without taxing themselves to death, are unable to build the roads. Build roads that are good roads for the rural carrier in the first place. Build roads that are good roads for the farmer to use in getting his grain and his stock to market. Build good roads that are necessary for the school children as they trudge their way from home to the country schoolhouse 1 mile or 2 miles or $2\frac{1}{2}$ or 3 miles away.

Good roads will add to the value of the farms along which the roads run. The assessed valuation of these farms will be greater, and not only the States but the National Government itself will in the end and in turn realize the benefit of this increased valuation caused by the construction of systems of good roads through the States.

Mr. President, I have not mentioned one other feature of this bill which commends itself to my mind very much indeed, and that is the feature which provides that preference shall be given to the soldiers, sailors, and marines seeking employment. The Senators who most deplore the labor situation and who are pleased to point out from time to time conditions with which we will be confronted in regard to labor a little later on, seem to ignore this one great means by which labor might be employed. It will mean employment to thousands of men. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] refers to the fact that it will not be convenient for certain laborers because, perhaps, the employment will be too far away from home; but if they are in earnest in seeking employment, if they are in real need of employment, they will not hesitate to go to some place within their own State or a neighboring State where good roads are being constructed through the combined work of the Federal Government and the State.

Mr. President, I appreciate what the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] has said in regard to the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], an amendment which would strike out the appropriation for the third year for which the appropriations are to run. The bill would be greatly crippled, the beneficent purposes of the bill would, in a large measure, be destroyed if there should be stricken out the appropriation for the year 1921. I can not state it in any better way than he himself has stated it. The authorities in the several States will require the entire three years in which to make their plans for the building of the projects and for the carrying out of those plans.

Mr. President, as I think over this good-roads amendment, what it is meant for, the good it has already accomplished in the many projects that have been built and those under construction, and of what I believe to be the moderate amount sought to be appropriated by the amendment, I am heartily in favor of it as it stands. I shall vote for it and shall vote against the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, there are many of us who are heartily in accord with the first two items of appropriation in this section, and it is very unfortunate if, in order to secure what are considered necessary appropriations, we are also compelled to vote for an appropriation that, it seems to some of us, can not be justified at this time. I shall vote for the amendment proposed by the Senator from Utah and I hope that it will be adopted.

The eminent chairman of the committee a little while ago stated that he considered this appropriation of \$75,000,000 for the year ending June 30, 1921, the most important item of any of the three items of appropriation. He stated that, in his opinion, if any of the three items were to be stricken out of the bill, the first two items should be stricken out and the item now in question should remain. I want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that the report made by the committee, and made by the chairman himself, presumably, so far as the report relates to this subject, with the exception of two or three lines, is devoted wholly to the first two items of appropriation and is based and justified upon the necessity of taking care of unemployment. Upon that ground this appropriation can be justified, and I heartily favor it. I would be willing to vote for \$200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30 next and the next fiscal year for the purpose of building good roads, because I believe that it would take care of the unemployment that now exists and that, I am afraid, is going to increase.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] stated that, in his opinion, there was no necessary unemployment. Mr. President, the facts that are coming to us from day to day and from week to week show beyond any question that unemployment is increasing in this country, and increasing with very rapid strides. That is entirely natural; it is to be expected.

In the first place, industry in this country to-day, Mr. President, is unwilling to go ahead for the future for two reasons: One is that industry does not know what the policy of this Government is going to be with reference to supervision, con-

trol, and restriction upon business. In the second place, a very large percentage of the production of this country normally is not for immediate consumption but is for consumption six months or a year from the time of production.

We have this situation in the United States to-day: The local merchant, believing that a fall in prices may follow, will not give his usual and normal orders to the wholesale houses to stock up his store. The wholesale houses do not get the orders, and the manufacturer is not getting any orders to-day for future production. So there must be during this transition period, during this period of uncertainty, a degree of unemployment. It is not the fault of anyone; it is a perfectly natural consequence.

Unemployment existing and increasing, I believe it is the duty and the obligation of the Federal Government during this period to do what it can to alleviate and to relieve that unemployment. It is very much better, Mr. President, to appropriate \$100,000,000 or \$200,000,000, if necessary, for the building of roads, thus relieving that unemployment, than to have soup houses established all over this land and for men to be compelled to look to charity or to starve. So the first two items in this section can be justified because they are necessary.

I believe that the policy of this Government ought to be to pay every just obligation that the Government has. Beyond that expenditures ought not to be made except for absolutely necessary public purposes; and the relief of unemployment may well be considered as a necessary purpose.

But when we come, Mr. President, to appropriate at this time, in addition to the \$125,000,000 that is contained in this amendment—and that I am in favor of—when we add to that \$75,000,000, to be used for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, how can it be justified in the present condition of the Treasury? Where are we going to get the money for these enormous appropriations? No Senator who favors the appropriation of this last \$75,000,000 has answered that question.

As I stated yesterday, the conference report upon the revenue bill will be before the Senate for adoption in a day or two. The conferees on that bill have agreed to a proposition coming from the other side of the aisle that during the year 1920 all of the taxes that can safely be imposed upon industries in this country, upon excess profits and upon incomes, together with the other provisions of the bill, will bring to the United States Treasury only \$4,000,000,000. You upon the other side of the aisle have said in that bill that we can get no more out of the profiteer; that we can not tax wealth any more than that. The difference between that \$4,000,000,000 and the expenditures that must be made and the appropriations that are now being made must come from where? That question has been asked a number of times. The chairman of the committee has not answered it; the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING], who has just spoken in favor of this bill, has not answered it. It can be answered only in two ways. Aside from a considerable increase in revenue through a revision of the tariff, which presumably the President of the United States would veto when a Republican Congress sends a bill to him, there is no other way by which we can augment substantially the revenues of the Government and that is to reduce the exemption of incomes, so that every person in this land must bear these additional taxes.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MYERS in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. So that there may not be an impression that all acquiesce in the public statement that the taxes under the revenue bill, the conference report of which will be presented to the Senate this coming week, will for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, raise \$4,000,000,000, I wish now to say that, if the bill passes just as it is printed, it will not raise \$4,000,000,000. If it raises \$3,250,000,000, it will be every cent that it will provide.

Mr. President, the proposition that that bill will raise \$4,000,000,000 is based upon an idea that the business for 1919 is going to be just as profitable as was the business for 1918; and there is not a man in the United States but knows that that will not be so.

Not only that, but I predict now that, with the relief provisions contained in the report, \$6,000,000,000 will not be raised by the bill this year. The amount raised will not much more than exceed \$5,000,000,000.

I wanted to make that statement in order that it may be taken for what it is worth. I have, however, studied the bill about as much as has any man in the United States, and I feel perfectly safe in stating that we are not going to raise \$4,000,000,000 by that bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, the statement of the Senator from Utah makes the situation just that much more serious. But assuming that the revenue bill will raise the amount that is estimated for 1920, namely, \$4,000,000,000, and the expenditures for that year amount to \$8,000,000,000, at the very least, where are we going to get the other \$4,000,000,000?

I do not think that the Republican side of this Chamber, that will soon be in control of legislation here, and the Republican majority at the other end of the Capitol are going so to revise these taxes that the burden will fall upon the great masses of people, and the man who earns \$400 or \$500 a year will be compelled to pay a heavy income tax. I do not believe that they are going to do that in order to meet the enormous appropriations that you are making. In my judgment, when 1920 comes and there is a deficit in the Treasury, the Congress of the United States will then say to the President of the United States, "Your administration is responsible for this condition; go out and borrow money in time of peace." You will have a bond issue in 1920 and you will sweep the Democratic Party from power when you do it. Of course, that is "a consummation devoutly to be wished" from a Republican standpoint; but I would prefer that there be a little sense of responsibility from a national standpoint concerning the expenditures of this Government.

Let me say in this connection, Mr. President, that complaint is very often made by Southern States against Republicans because they have sometimes called attention to what they term a sectional issue in this Government. It is true that the Republicans have called attention to the control of legislation by Southern States; but by the action of Southern States, as represented in both Houses of Congress, they are continually demonstrating that from that section there is very little responsibility from a national standpoint concerning expenditures, provided only the appropriations shall be expended in their own States.

A river and harbor bill might be proposed here, and there is scarcely any sum that might be appropriated in that river and harbor bill that would not receive almost the solid support of the Southern States, provided that they thought they got their share of the appropriation.

Mr. President, Senators have got to have some sense of responsibility to this country as a nation, as well as a sense of responsibility to their own States and to their own sections. Under this bill the \$75,000,000 carried by the amendment it is now proposed to strike out would benefit the State of Wisconsin undoubtedly to a greater extent than the taxes paid by the people of my State for the good-roads expenditure; but I should feel that I had no right to occupy a place in the Senate if I were to make the controlling factor of my action upon bills the question whether my State would get more than it paid under a given proposition.

I am in favor of good roads; I am in favor of the Government assisting with most liberal appropriations for good roads. If the Treasury were in a condition to permit it, I would not oppose the appropriation for the year 1921, but it can not be justified under present conditions, and appropriations for good roads at this time at all can only be justified because of the benefit that will also come to the country through alleviating the unemployment that exists and that will increase.

I am therefore in favor of the \$125,000,000 appropriated by the first two items of the committee amendment. I shall vote in favor of the amendment striking out the last \$75,000,000, and I hope that amendment will be adopted, because, believing as I do in the very great necessity of this \$125,000,000, I shall feel sorry to be compelled in order to secure that to vote for an additional \$75,000,000, which I do not believe should be appropriated at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. KENYON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bankhead	Kenyon	New	Spencer
Colt	King	Overman	Sterling
Dillingham	Kirby	Page	Sutherland
Fernald	Knox	Poin Dexter	Swanson
Fletcher	La Follette	Pollock	Thomas
France	Lenroot	Pomerene	Thompson
Frelinghuysen	Lewis	Saulsbury	Townsend
Gay	Lodge	Shafroth	Vardaman
Gore	McCumber	Shepard	Wadsworth
Hale	McLean	Simmons	Warren
Harding	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ariz.	Wolcott
Johnson, Cal.	Moses	Smith, Ga.	
Jones, Wash.	Myers	Smith, S. C.	
Kellogg	Nelson	Smoot	

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I desire to announce that the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] and the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] are detained by illness.

Mr. FRANCE. I desire to announce the absence of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL] on official business of the Senate.

Mr. SPENCER. I desire to announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. NUGENT] are detained in attendance on the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I wish to announce, as no announcement has been made of it before, that I have been detained from the Senate since last Saturday on account of sickness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-three Senators have answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the pending amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah to the amendment reported by the committee.

The SECRETARY. In the amendment reported by the committee, on page 37, lines 10 and 11, after the numerals "1920," it is proposed to strike out "and the sum of \$75,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921."

Mr. SMOOT. I ask for the yeas and nays on the adoption of the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, on July 11, 1916, there was approved the road act which had previously been passed by Congress. That act was passed before we entered the war. It had very careful consideration by Congress, and I think that Congress considered that we went as far as we ought to go in providing for ordinary peace-time expenditures in aid of road building by the National Government. I voted for that act.

The amendment that is now before the Senate provides that the sum of \$50,000,000 shall be appropriated in addition to the amount provided by existing law, and be expended under the terms of existing law as amended by section 5 of this bill, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, to be immediately available. It also provides that the sum of \$75,000,000 shall be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and also that the sum of \$75,000,000 shall be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921. This latter item is the item which the Senator from Utah by his amendment proposes to strike out.

I was very much surprised at the statement by the chairman of the committee that this is the most important item in this amendment, and that if this item is stricken out the purpose and object of the amendment of the committee will be nullified.

I had the impression, Mr. President, that the committee placed this proposed amendment in the bill in order to take care, to a very large extent, of any possible labor needs that might arise in the immediate future in connection with the readjustment of conditions that naturally grow out of the cessation of the war; and so I was very much surprised to hear that statement from the chairman of the committee. I favor the appropriation contained in the first two items of section 6, not for the primary purpose of building roads but to let the Government set the example for business enterprise to go on, and in that way furnish employment for the men coming home as well as those at home who probably will be out of employment. If the Government stops Government work, private enterprise can not be expected to proceed.

The Senator from Mississippi stated that the primary purpose of this provision is to build roads; and in very eloquent language he described the benefits that come to the country from building good roads. As I said, I did not understand that that was the primary purpose of this legislation. I recognize the great benefits that come from good roads. Nothing can do more to promote the happiness and comfort of living or do more to reduce costs than good roads. I believe in the National Government going as far as it feels that it ought to go to aid in the construction of good roads; but I feel that Congress, in the passage of the act of July 11, 1916, did go as far as it thought the National Government ought to go in normal peace times; and so I believed that the primary purpose and object to be served in the injection of this provision into the Post Office bill was to take care of the possible difficulties in connection with labor during the next year or two. That is the only basis upon which I can justify myself, under the conditions that

confront us now, in voting for these two items, and this was the ground stated for it when the bill was reported.

I can see nothing whatever to justify a vote for this \$75,000,000 for 1921. There will be ample time between now and then to determine whether or not we should make any additional appropriation for road purposes at that time. I shall not repeat what has been said as to the condition of the Treasury, or the condition of our revenues, or the obligations confronting this Government, or what may be the effect of increasing these obligations at this time and the consequent tax on business and enterprise; but no reason has been presented that appeals to my judgment justifying this appropriation of \$75,000,000 for 1921.

I do not consider this, however, from the standpoint of waste. I do not think expenditures for good roads are a waste. I think, rather, they are an investment; and if we were not confronted by the condition of things that confronts us now with reference to revenues and obligations and indebtedness of the Government, and so forth, I would be perfectly willing for us to obligate ourselves to invest \$75,000,000 in 1921, and possibly more. We have a bill now on the calendar of the Senate to cancel, in effect, \$15,000,000,000 of obligations that Congress obligated this Government to pay for carrying on the war. We did it promptly; we obligated ourselves to pay this money without hesitation, in order to insure the successful ending of the war. This money would very largely have been actually wasted. It would very largely have been expended for ammunition that would have been shot away; and, so far as any good is concerned, outside of bringing the war to a successful close, it would have been actually wasted and destroyed. Taking this into account, I can justify myself in voting for \$50,000,000 additional for 1919—I would vote for a larger sum—and even \$75,000,000 additional for 1920, for building good roads in this country. That will be a lasting investment; that will result in the future in far greater good than can be measured by the expenditure that we make. I would be willing, Mr. President, under the conditions that confront us, to take this \$75,000,000 for 1921 and put it on to the \$50,000,000 for 1919 rather than put it in 1921. I think we would have some justification for doing that. I believe that this \$50,000,000 in 1919 ought to be increased, because if we need any money to take care of the labor situation, we need it promptly. We need it without delay. There are proposals pending before the Senate and before Congress to appropriate \$100,000,000 and larger sums for the distinct and avowed purpose of taking care of the labor situation.

Mr. President, I have not had time to examine all of these proposals. I have examined some of them, and it seems to me that they would not serve the purpose that they are intended or urged to serve, for the reason that they do not provide any machinery for laying the foundation upon which this work can be carried out promptly. I think we have the machinery here. We have the road organization. It is already made upon the part of the National Government. It also exists upon the part of most, if not all, of the States; and, as the chairman of the committee stated awhile ago, as soon as this money is appropriated and made available it can be used upon projects that have been investigated, reported upon, and that are ready to be carried out. Employment can begin at once and the needs of the hour met.

I think the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] suggests that \$100,000,000 should be made available, to be expended when and where the Secretary of Labor shall certify that there is unemployment that needs the expenditure of this money.

Mr. President, you can not start upon the expenditure of money for building roads, for instance, until after your engineers have mapped out, laid out, and passed upon the plans to be put into effect; and that takes time. It has already been done here, and that is one reason why I am in favor of this provision—that it takes advantage of the organization already existing, of the plans already made, perfected, and approved. It insures a wise and economical expenditure of whatever money we may desire to expend. The Secretary of Labor has no machinery to lay out this kind of work. He could not begin it to any advantage. The Government can not afford to spend money everywhere there may be unemployment. There must be a project to which labor may come rather than taking the projects to labor.

I do not expect that this money will be expended—not very largely, at any rate—for labor that is now congregated in the cities. It has been suggested here that they are not going to leave the cities and go out into the country to work on roads. That is probably true. I am inclined to think that it is true; but wherever we may start this road building we will get a

certain amount of labor that otherwise would be employed somewhere else; and this is in line with the suggestion of the Senator from Colorado. We are going to make employment available instead of proposing to make the unemployed take some particular job. We are going to give the idle man no excuse for remaining idle; and I have very little sympathy for the man who is idle when jobs are calling for him and employment is awaiting him, even though it may not be the kind he especially desires.

Mr. President, I have introduced an amendment, proposed to be appended to the sundry civil appropriation bill, providing for \$50,000,000 to be used in carrying on and prosecuting irrigation works that have already been undertaken and on which work has been largely stopped during the war. I had in mind submitting an amendment something like this amendment also. I spoke to the chairman of this committee about it, and he advised me then that his committee was reporting something of this kind. I had in mind what I have just pointed out, that there is an organization already in existence and plans already prepared upon which we could expend the money. So, in connection with irrigation works, we have a great proposal by the Secretary of the Interior that would involve the expenditure of billions of dollars in order to make it amount to anything. It is presented to Congress upon the theory of furnishing employment for returning soldiers. Why, Mr. President, it will be years, under that plan and that proposal, before any work would be ready for them; so I introduced this amendment providing the appropriation of \$50,000,000 to be expended upon existing projects—projects that already have been surveyed, estimated for, approved, and in many cases actually undertaken.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. For my own information I should like to ask whether the plan of the Secretary of the Interior, to which the Senator has just referred, is so Utopian, so unrealizable, that it is not available and may not be available for immediate use by those who need employment?

As I understood the Senator it called for the appropriation of billions of dollars, and the plan could not be put in operation for years. I am very much interested in ascertaining whether that is the character of plan which the Secretary of the Interior has formulated and which he is asking the country to adopt.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think that if the Senator will investigate it and examine it carefully, he will come to the same conclusion that I have reached, that in order to carry it out to the full extent it will involve the appropriation of billions of dollars and that it will be a long time before it can be actually undertaken to any appreciable extent.

Mr. KING. If there is such a stupendous plan as that, I do not think it will get very far in either branch of Congress; but my understanding was that the Secretary of the Interior had devised a plan which he intended to submit, if it had not already been submitted, which called for the expenditure of approximately \$200,000,000 for the reclamation of arid lands, as well as certain swamp and cut-over lands, and from which appropriation there would be drawn sufficient to enable those who desired homes to enter upon those lands and to make a start that would enable them to make a livelihood. I had not heard of the plan that called for the appropriation of billions.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Oh, Mr. President, the provision presented does not call for billions. It calls for a hundred million; but there is not anybody that can study that plan for a little while, knowing the conditions throughout the country and what will have to be done, but that will know that that is only a drop in the bucket as to the expenditures that will be necessary to make it of any substantial benefit.

Why, Mr. President, it involves swamp lands and logged-off lands, and involves, before it can be put into effect, the acquirement of those lands by the National Government, because they are practically all in private ownership now; and before they can be made available for homes they must be reclaimed, and these logged-off lands must be cleared, too. I do not know what logged-off lands in other sections of the country cost to reclaim, but the expense in my section is from \$100 to \$150 an acre. It is all right to hold out the hope of furnishing to our boys homes on logged-off lands; but if there is any boy from the East who will go out and look at an acre of logged-off land in my section and say, "I want to go there and take up and build and dig out a home," he is not a man that is going to spend his time on that sort of land or in that sort of work. He has the courage and the stamina and the determination that will enable him to do something else far better for himself and the country. The Secretary's conception is a grand one. It does him great credit. If it can be worked out, it will be a great thing for the country. I will help work it out. I will

be glad to aid those seeking homes to get them. We will have to do something along the lines he suggests if we would have our remaining lands taken up and settled upon. This will take time to work out and carry out. It will not meet the emergency that confronts us.

I should like to see us do something along these lines. I should like to see us make our swamp lands available. I introduced a bill myself, a few years ago, to assist and aid in the reclamation of swamp lands, logged-off lands, and so forth; and I will join with our Senators and Representatives from the States where these swamp lands are, in trying to frame legislation that will result in the reclamation of these lands; and I think it can be very easily done. But those who seem to think that the same kind of legislation that will apply to arid lands will apply to swamp lands are mistaken. You can not enforce the same rules and regulations with reference to the reclamation of swamp lands that you can enforce with reference to the reclamation and irrigation of arid lands. The National Government can put its money into the reclamation and irrigation of arid lands, and it can enforce payment. How? Simply by shutting off water for the man who does not pay. But when you reclaim swamp land it is reclaimed, and you have no remedy of that sort to enforce the claims of the Government to reimbursement. I do not think it would be very difficult to organize districts under which liens could be enforced against reclaimed swamp lands for the money expended by the National Government; but I did not intend to go into that discussion. I will be glad to help frame legislation along these lines and for this purpose, however. I simply want to point out the fact that we have an existing road organization, we have an existing irrigation organization, that can be used at once, and that can use almost any reasonable sum of money that we can make available to carry on these very desirable works, and works that will form reservoirs for the employment of those who are needing work. As I said, I have introduced a provision for spending \$50,000,000 on irrigation works already approved or begun. The places are ready. Work can be begun at once. Employment can be offered to-morrow. This is no more than a loan. It will increase production, add wealth to the community, and bring comfort and happiness.

Some criticism is made here of the provision giving a preference to returning soldiers. Mr. President, I do not see any real, just basis for criticism of that. We do make a preference for the soldiers in many different lines. We exercised a preference when we took the soldiers to war. The Government exercised a preference when it selected these men who went to fight our battles; so it is not very much out of place, I think, simply to say that if a soldier presents himself and asks for employment, and another man presents himself at the same time and asks for employment, and you have employment for only one, you should give the preference to the soldier. He has earned it; he deserves it.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Since the Government denied the soldier any right to select for himself when he was conscripted and sent to the war, I think it is very proper to give him the preference at the hands of the Government when he applies for work.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do not think there is anything improper about it, I am sure.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Nor I, either.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do not expect very many of the soldiers to ask for this preference. I doubt if very many of them will seek employment to work as day laborers upon these roads. I hope they may not have to do it; but if they do, although there are many worse things, then I can see very much justification for the little preference given here in this bill.

Now, Mr. President, my idea is just this: If we deem it wise to make additional appropriations for building roads or reclaiming arid or other lands in order to take care of a possibly distressing situation that is very likely to confront us, and I do think it wise, let us do it through the organizations that are already perfected and can carry on the work, and do it promptly, so as to meet the exigency of the situation; but let us not obligate ourselves for \$75,000,000 in 1921, years ahead. There is ample time to take care of the situation between now and then, and when the real necessities come up.

I hope that that item will be stricken out. I would not object to having this added to the amount for 1919. I really wish that amount were increased from \$50,000,000 to \$125,000,000. I think that would be wise. That would serve a good purpose.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I shall occupy the attention of the Senate but a moment. Reference has been made by honorable Senators several times to a remark I made a little while

ago about the primary purpose of this law being to provide for road building and not to give employment to soldiers or men coming back from the war. I wish it distinctly understood that it is my judgment and my desire that the Government ought to offer every proper encouragement and facility for the men coming back from the war to make a decent support for themselves. I do not think there is going to be any trouble for any man who desires work to find it. As has been so happily expressed by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], the farmers are crying for farm labor. Not a day passes, Mr. President, but that I receive from 1 to 50 letters from my constituents in Mississippi urging me to use what little influence I may have with the War Department to get their boys out of the Army in order that they may come back and help to make a crop the present year. And let me say just here that if the boys are not permitted to go home pretty soon, they will not be able to make a crop during the year 1919. I think it an outrage, an injustice to the soldiers, and a misfortune to the country that the farmers' boys are not discharged and sent back to their homes.

Now, returning to the question at issue, may I say that it is a very happy combination of circumstances that the provisions of this bill will not only build roads for the people living in the country but will also furnish in road building employment for the unemployed. Two splendid purposes are effected.

The building of these roads will be a positive blessing to the tillers of the soil, who must in the end bear the largest part of the taxation which is to pay for all governmental expenses.

Mr. President, I hope the bill may not be changed by the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT]. The honorable chairman of the committee [Mr. BANKHEAD] has devoted a great deal of patient study to the construction of this bill. Under his leadership the committee has cooperated with him, and I fear if the amendment offered by the able Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] shall be adopted, it will destroy the symmetry of the bill and the good order of things which the bill establishes when it becomes a law. The effect of the passage of this bill is going to be very helpful and beneficial to the agricultural classes of this country. May I be permitted to impress upon the Senate that when you help the farmers of this country; when you make farm life less burdensome and more attractive; whatever may be done that adds to the fertility of the soil; increase facilities for carrying the products of the farm to the market and bringing from the towns things that the farmers have to buy—in other words, when you help the farmer you benefit every other class of society living beneath the American flag.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I shall not undertake to discuss this measure in any detail. I am extremely anxious that we should come to a vote on it and get it disposed of and go on with other business of the Senate. It is very important that we should dispense with all discussion that can reasonably be dispensed with and proceed especially with the enactment of the supply bills, and we have not any time to lose. I promise to take but a very few moments. I am in favor of the measure and in favor of the bill as reported by the committee, and I hope it will be passed.

I rose more particularly to make some reference to the closing remarks of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT]. I scarcely feel that those remarks ought to be allowed to stand without comment and to pass unnoticed.

The Senator took occasion to refer to the position of the South in reference to legislation, and the representatives of the South, both in the House and in the Senate, he stated, were devoid of that proper sense of responsibility in matters of legislation. He went on further to say that these representatives of the South were in favor of any appropriation so long as they got their share of it.

Mr. ROBINSON. May I inquire of the Senator from Florida if that statement was made on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. FLETCHER. It was.

Mr. ROBINSON. By whom?

Mr. FLETCHER. By the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], as I caught his statement, and I am quite sure I do not exaggerate it in any way. That certainly was the substance of it and the impression that would be made upon any one hearing the statement.

I am disappointed in that sort of a statement being made here by the Senator from Wisconsin. I can understand how something of that sort might be said on the stump in the heat of a political campaign, for political purposes, but a statement coming like that goes beyond all bounds of propriety or of justice and is wholly unwarranted.

I can not help feeling, frankness compels me to say it, an utter contempt for that man in public or private life who would

array one section of this country against another or the people of one section against the people of another section. I have never classed the Senator from Wisconsin among those who would do that, and I do not now. I think he probably allowed his zeal in the argument he was making to go further than he really feels himself he was justified in going. I want to retain that respect which I have always entertained for the Senator, and I propose to do so if he will allow me, but I can not permit a statement of that sort to stand without some protest. Without going into any detailed discussion of that matter or of that idea I would like to put this inquiry: What proportion of this billion dollars that goes to the wheat growers of the country goes to the South?

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON. I was not present when the statement referred to by the Senator from Florida was made by the Senator from Wisconsin. I ask the Senator from Florida if he heard the statement which he has attributed to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes, I am sorry to say, I heard the statement.

Mr. ROBINSON. With the permission of the Senator from Florida, I desire to say that it is inconceivable to me that a Member of this body would make such a statement unless he had the deliberate purpose to insult a large number of the Members of this body.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator from Wisconsin intended that. I do think that his observations were such that they ought to be responded to and such as were unwarranted. In reference to the illustration which he made in submitting those remarks, to wit, the river and harbor bill, he said that was an illustration of the attitude of the South's representatives here, evidently meaning to say that so long as that bill carried appropriations which were satisfactory to the South there was no limit to the other appropriations the representatives from the South would favor and that might be carried in it, according to their view, without regard to the merits of the different items and projects involved in the appropriations. That is not a fair statement to make. It is not the fault of the South, it is not the fault of southern representatives; it is not a subject about which they should be criticized that there lies south of us the great Gulf of Mexico, the Mediterranean of the Western World, and on its borders are harbors and ports unequalled in any country. According to the great law of nature, water runs downhill, and therefore rivers pour into the Gulf of Mexico, and they happen to run through the South. According to that law of nature water flows to the South Atlantic, and therefore the navigable rivers of the country are largely found in that portion of the country, and it is inevitable if you are going to improve the rivers and harbors of the country you must go where the rivers and harbors are.

It therefore follows that there are provisions in the river and harbor bill which appertain to rivers and harbors and ports which lie in the South; but anyone can take the river and harbor bill and the items of appropriation and readily see, I will venture to say, that more than three-fourths of the amount carried by that bill is spent in other portions of the country than in the South, mainly in the North and East. It is not true that the South gets its undue proportion or even its just and proper proportion of the appropriations carried by that bill, and certainly it is not true that there is any disposition to vote unlimited appropriations in that or any other bill by the representatives of the South on condition that they get what may be considered by them as a satisfactory share of the appropriations.

Mr. McKEILLAR. Mr. President, I will detain the Senate only a moment. I regard this road provision of the bill as the best piece of legislation that has come before Congress at this session. It provides simply that the present legislation on the subject of roads shall be extended. It requires States or subdivisions thereof to put up an equal amount that the National Government puts up for roads. It provides that it shall be done under existing machinery. It provides for the betterment of the entire country, because when we spend money on building roads we not only benefit the localities but we benefit the entire country.

Mr. President, for a number of years I have strongly advocated this kind of legislation. In the House, before I came to the Senate, I took a very active part in legislation of this character. I recall that in 1911 those who believed in this legislation were derided and laughed at as "dirt-road statesmen," but you will see that in the years that have passed since that time there has been quite a change in the public mind, and now practically everyone knows that there is no better legislation than

the kind of legislation embodied in this amendment, and none that means so much to the building up of our common country in a proper way.

It is peculiarly proper at this time, when we have millions of soldiers coming back home, many of whom will be without work. This will give them work, and the kind of work that will build up the country. It is not directed to any State or any part of the country, but it is applicable to the entire country, and it aids the State organizations in building up the country.

There is another statement I wish to make here in reference to this item. I wish to call the attention of the Senate and of the country to the splendid work of the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], on the question of roads in this country. He was a pioneer in this movement. I believe he was the author of one of the very first bills many years ago that was brought in to bring to bear the very best efforts of the National Government to build up post roads in this country. At the time he began it was not popular and it took him many years to finally get a bill enacted, but through his efforts and those of his associates, largely through his efforts, the present law was passed, a law that the people of this country have virtually unanimously indorsed. I doubt if one could find a single Member of Congress who would vote to repeal the present law. This is an enlargement of it. The Senator from Alabama has had a long and distinguished record in the House first and then in this body. His name is attached to much important legislation, but never in his career has he done such a splendid work for the entire country as he did in bringing forth from his committee this particular legislation, which will mean more to our entire country than all the legislation that he has been connected with in his long and splendid career.

For those reasons I hope the Senate will vote speedily on this bill. Let us pass it and make it a law. The country approves it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBINSON in the chair). The question is on the amendment to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I shall take just a moment. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], in the remarks made by him, seemed to gather that in his judgment, from the remark made by me a little while ago, I reflected upon the integrity and honesty of Senators from Southern States. As the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] suggested, there was nothing of that kind in the remarks I made.

I was discussing the sense of responsibility for Government expenditures, responsibility from a sectional standpoint as compared to a national standpoint. From my observations during 10 years in Congress I felt justified in making the statement I did. I have nothing to retract. I do not for a moment question the good faith, the integrity, of the Senators from those States, but the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the past years since I have been in Congress at least will demonstrate the truth of what I said.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. LENROOT. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does not the Senator from Wisconsin think that now, at all events, we can all be merely Americans, and good Americans, and forget for all time the question of sectionalism?

Mr. LENROOT. Exactly, Mr. President; there is no man in the United States who is more desirous of that than I am, but it can not be done unless every Senator and every Representative, regardless of the section from which he comes, will treat his country as a nation and his primary responsibility to it as a nation rather than as a section.

Mr. TOWNSEND obtained the floor.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President—

Mr. TOWNSEND. I will yield to the Senator.

Mr. FLETCHER. I wish to say, before the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] leaves the Chamber, that it seems to me that the two statements can not coincide or harmonize. In one statement he says that he does not intend to question the integrity and the patriotism of the representatives of the Southern States, but, on the other hand, he says that they have an utter lack of a sense of responsibility concerning matters of legislation.

Mr. LENROOT. No.

Mr. FLETCHER. The two statements can not very well stand together.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. LENROOT. That is not what the Senator from Wisconsin said at all. The Senator from Wisconsin said that sectional

responsibility comes first, in the judgment of the Senator from Wisconsin, rather than a national responsibility.

Mr. FLETCHER. I have no patience with the spirit and attitude emphasized by the further remarks of the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS. If the Senator will yield to me for a moment, I merely wish to say that that criticism is applicable to every section of the Union.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the public record, and the general estimate of the informed and intelligent, right-thinking people all over the country will prove that the representatives from the Southern States are just as broad-minded and as patriotic, and have just as clear a vision of national needs and as clear a conception of fiduciary responsibility as the representatives from any other portion of the country—North, East, or West.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay action on this measure and perhaps I ought not to say anything, but as a member of the committee and called upon shortly to vote upon this proposition, I desire to say just a very few words.

As the members of the committee understand, I am not enamored with this form of road legislation. I did not think the original proposition was the best way for the Government to engage in highway construction, but we adopted that plan in 1916, and it has to some extent—quite a large extent—been put in operation.

These road projects necessarily are projected into the future to a great extent. I think of all times the present is the worst to curtail or to attempt to curtail in any way the activities of the Government in public improvements. I do believe that inasmuch as we have, as the Senator from Washington has stated, a going machine, an organization for building roads, and inasmuch, further, as it is conceded that the general welfare demands that the Government must encourage those enterprises of a public nature which offer legitimate employment to labor and at the same time supply a public service, it seems wise to me to increase road building. This class of improvement was checked by the war, and now, in this period of reconstruction, the work should be renewed on a larger scale.

I believed and still believe that we ought to have a nationalized system of roads. I hope before another Congress expires we shall have before us a general scheme for building roads which will favorably appeal to a majority of Congress. But it is too late to enact new legislation in this Congress. I suggested a more comprehensive and scientific plan to the committee, but it could not be considered. To my mind it does not make much difference whether we cut out this \$75,000,000 for 1921 or leave it in, because if my hopes shall be realized we will change existing law before 1921 and be upon a sound basis for Federal road building.

But I submit, Mr. President, that this appropriation is as wise an investment as we can make now in these disturbed conditions, however difficult our financial situation may be. This investment will at once serve the people in one of the best manners possible and at the same time give employment to the people who require it. I think the appropriation will be used profitably. I hope the various State highway commissions will see to it that it is so expended that it will contribute to a national system, which I am sure this country must adopt sooner or later. I want the United States to build national highways, so far as it is able to do it, and assume responsibility for them. Let the States build the laterals, but have a system of national highways extending through every State, east and west, north and south.

I have not been pleased with the administration of this law in the Department of Agriculture. I think the money has not been as wisely expended as it should have been, but we are learning in the matter of road building. The States themselves are cooperating now, and every year makes them wiser in the matter of road construction, and I can not believe that very much of this money will be wasted. Therefore, Mr. President, while I am not heartily in favor of this system, because I believe there is a better one, nevertheless it being inaugurated and this being the present opportunity to render aid in this emergency of reconstruction, I feel it is wise to pass the bill.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I am opposed to the amendment to the amendment. I, with others, shudder almost continuously when I think of the amount of money we are expending, but I do not know of any better way of spending money, if we undertake to furnish employment to the returning soldiers and others, than to take advantage of the machinery and plans like this State and Federal road building, already planned and in process, something that will afford employment, that can keep them from poverty or idleness, something that is helpful and will take them into parts of the country where they are

most needed in agriculture and other lines and relieve the congestion in the cities.

There are many of the States, especially in the North, in which little can be done in the winter, and while this sounds like three years—1919, 1920, and 1921—as a matter of fact it is simply two seasons. The third season is a matter of May and June, quitting in July, and leaves very little of that working season. So if we are to pass this measure at all I believe we ought to pass it with the \$75,000,000 proposed for this third expenditure.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WARREN. I yield.

Mr. KING. Probably with the reorganization of the Congress the distinguished Senator from Wyoming will be chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. The Senator may be called upon to prepare appropriation bills or aid in their preparation calling for at least \$10,000,000,000—possibly a little more—for the year 1920. Has the Senator thought of the avenues from which the funds are coming with which to meet it?

Mr. WARREN. For what purposes?

Mr. KING. For governmental purposes, for obligations many of which already have been created, for obligations which have not yet matured but which, as sure as the day follows the night, will mature, and which will have to be met by the Government. Does not the Senator think that it is about time to try to practice a little economy and quit trying to find plausible reasons to justify every sort of an expenditure under the sun?

Mr. WARREN. Does the Senator consider that this is a rather forced plausible reason for the expenditure of money where we can employ the returning soldiers?

Mr. KING. I think the argument of the Senator has been a fallacious one and the reasons assigned in support of the appropriation are fallacious but plausible.

Mr. WARREN. I thank the Senator for his comment. I will say to him, with reference to my service upon the Committee on Appropriations, that that committee does not provide for the income of the country. It does not provide for the outgo except to appropriate money that has already been called for through legislation.

Mr. KING. Of course, the Senator, I understand, takes the same position as the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], who said that the duty rested upon the Finance Committee to provide the money, and that the rest of the Senators—that was the idea—would spend it. I do not think the Senator ought to shirk a responsibility which must rest upon us all.

Mr. WARREN. The distinguished Senator from Utah nearly always finds a way to allege something wrong with appropriations necessary to run the Government. He has been quite successful in some of those attempts to defeat legislation, but I think he will have to bear with us this time and carry the bill through just the same.

When the Senator talks about my remarks being fallacious I enjoy that, as he evidently does, but I am in good earnest when I say that, if we are to spend any money at all in building these roads, we want to give those States an opportunity to make some use of it that have not so far obtained the use of it. The taking of this last year off leaves it simply with one full season. So far as that is concerned, the benefit to the States of the last \$75,000,000 is more valuable dollar for dollar than either one of the others.

When it comes to the matter of employment of labor, I hesitate to say, nevertheless I believe it is true, that we will need just as much in the way of public works and looking out for labor in 1920, and even in 1921, as in 1919, because other Senators know as well as I do that we have had a declaration from those who undertake to represent labor that there will be no reduction in their wages. We know from all quarters that the consuming public is not now buying anything except from day to day, because they expect lower prices. Hence the retailers have not been buying of the wholesalers; the wholesalers have not been buying of the manufacturers or producers; work in manufacturing is slack; and the consequence is that business must hesitate somewhere until it can reorganize, and it will take at least two or three years for that reorganization.

Now, shall we employ our men to the best of our ability during the time; and if so, how? The Senator will not deny that the building of roads in this country is more needed than any other improvement in a public way or a local way. Now is the time for us to pass this bill. I am perfectly content to see the bill beaten, as I am to see other matters of public buildings or matters of improvement generally, if we are to cease all public work and all expenditures and let the business of the country go to the dogs; but if we are at all to consider the matter of labor, the matter of our workmen having employment, then

I want to take it, as the Senator from Washington has already said, where the tools and working machinery are present, where plans are already made, and everything is ready to engage labor at once.

I have no sympathy with the workingman who wants to stay in the city and would rather stay there and starve or partake of charity than to go into the country and work on a farm or work on roads. We talk very much about "back to the farm." What inducement are we offering to people to go back to the farm? Shall we erect buildings in large places to give employment to these men, to keep them from going into the country, or shall we do something in the way of improvement in the country, in the new parts of the country, where these men can not only be afforded daily, monthly, yearly labor, but where they will contribute something to the welfare of the country that all can use.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

Mr. WARREN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree with what the Senator says, but I wish to ask him if it would not be very much better to furnish employment in this way to men who want it and need it than to furnish food to unemployed men?

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I was very much alive 25 years ago, when we had Coxey's armies and soup houses and bread lines; I do not want to see them again; but I say to Senators in all earnestness, if we do not act wisely in providing in some way for the men who are coming home, for the men who are being discharged from the Army and those who will be discharged by manufacturers who can not pay out 100 cents and only get back 50 cents, we shall have those times over again, and perhaps worse.

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree with the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, among the justifications for this appropriation is the one referred to by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN]; that is, to give employment to the unemployed caused by the return of our soldiers to civil life. The Senator says that there are only two seasons in which this money can be used. I think he is mistaken in that.

Mr. WARREN. I spoke of the Northern States.

Mr. SMOOT. I say in any State.

Mr. WARREN. If I am not mistaken, this appropriation would end on the 1st day of July, 1921, two years from now.

Mr. SMOOT. No; the Senator is mistaken.

Mr. WARREN. I am speaking of the bill where it reads—

Mr. SMOOT. But it refers to the present law. The money can be expended under the present law, and that law extends the time.

Mr. WARREN. I am very glad it does.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, all I desired to do was to say that this appropriation as a whole can be expended for the season of 1919, it can be expended for the season of 1920, it can be expended for the season of 1921, and for the season of 1922. I believe it is unwise, Mr. President, for us to begin to make appropriations to take care of the unemployed in 1922.

Mr. WARREN. Am I to understand that there is anything in this bill which we now have under consideration that alludes to 1922?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes. It says that these appropriations are to "be expended in accordance with the provisions of said act." That is the act of July 11, 1916.

Mr. WARREN. But that matter is not before us to pass on.

Mr. SMOOT. But the money is to be expended under that act, and that extends the appropriation a year. This is what it provides; and if Senators will look at it they will see that there can not be any question about that statement. I make it without hesitation. So, Mr. President, I say that it is unwise for us to appropriate money to-day to take care of the unemployment for the year 1922. It may be that before that time we shall have not only to spend \$75,000,000 or \$200,000,000, as the whole appropriation provides, but that we may have to spend many times that sum. However, let us not legislate until we are informed as to conditions.

Mr. President, as I look at the situation by which we are confronted to-day and consider the obligations this country has to meet for the years to come, I am appalled.

Mr. McKELLAR. We can repeal this next year.

Mr. SMOOT. No; I will say to the Senator that it can not be repealed, for I say that there never has been an appropriation made under conditions of this kind where it was ever repealed.

Mr. McKELLAR. This is right; and we shall not repeal it, of course.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator says this is right. I disagree with him.

I am perfectly willing to increase the \$50,000,000 provided for this year in order that the unemployed may be given employment in the near future, and I am perfectly willing to take the \$75,000,000 provided for the fiscal year 1920, add it to the \$50,000,000 made immediately available, and let the \$125,000,000 be spent as quickly as possible.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah permit me to interrupt him?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I want to end this controversy. The Senator from Utah says he is perfectly willing to add this seventy-five millions for 1920.

Mr. SMOOT. I say seventy-five millions, making it \$125,000,000, and cut out \$75,000,000—

Mr. BANKHEAD. For the third year—1921?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I am perfectly willing to do that.

Mr. BANKHEAD. And add that to what?

Mr. SMOOT. I am perfectly willing to allow the language to read as follows—now, I want the Senator to follow me:

SEC. 6. That for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of said act, as herein amended, there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$125,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and to be made available immediately, to be expended in accordance with the provisions of said act—

Referring to the act of July 11, 1916. In other words, it means that we should appropriate \$125,000,000; that it shall be immediately available, and with the view that it shall be spent upon the roads to take care of the unemployment in this country. I want to ask the Senator from Alabama if he is willing to accept that?

Mr. McKELLAR. If I understood the Senator, he does accept it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Is it the purpose of the Senator to make the appropriation for 1919 \$125,000,000, and then stop and make no further appropriations?

Mr. SMOOT. That is my proposition.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Then, of course, nobody could accept a proposition like that, except the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator now understands my proposition. Of course, he was perfectly willing, as I see now, that we should add \$75,000,000 for this year, but he also wanted the other appropriation for the following year. Anybody who is in favor of this kind of legislation would accept a proposition of that kind.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah allow me to interrupt him?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SWANSON. The law which exists to-day runs to 1921. We do not extend the law; we simply increase the appropriations under existing law.

Mr. SMOOT. That is true.

Mr. SWANSON. If a system of road improvement were started, we thought it would be unwise to stop it abruptly. We have not tried to extend it to 1922 or 1923, over what the existing law provides for. This is simply to increase the appropriations for expenditure under the existing law.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course, I want to be perfectly frank with the Senator, and I will say I think that when we begin the building of roads by the Government, it ought to be under a well-digested plan for the expenditure of the public money. I remember two years ago when the first proposition was brought before Congress in reference to this matter, I offered at that time a substitute for it, providing a general plan for road building in the United States. When the proper time comes, I intend to again offer that same amendment, providing for a road system. I have no idea that it will be accepted, for it takes no money out of the Treasury of the United States, but I wish to say that when I presented the proposition two years ago—and it is not any plan of mine; I do not want to take any credit for it; I have no right to receive any credit for it—it was not to be adopted because of the fact, it was said, that it provided a great big system of road building throughout the country, and that we wanted something immediately.

The plan two years ago was to appropriate \$75,000,000 as a temporary measure, and, of course, Mr. President, it is like all other temporary appropriations. They soon find their way into the regular appropriation bills; and the policy adopted in the temporary appropriations becomes permanent.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator from Utah has assumed that I was mistaken in my statement, and I am always modest enough to admit that I am mistaken; but I should like to have him show why I am mistaken; why he contends that this bill is appropriating money for 1922 for this purpose.

Mr. SMOOT. The bill under section 5 extends the time one year by reenacting existing law.

Mr. WARREN. I am not speaking of what is in the Senator's mind. I am speaking of what is before us and what we are to vote on.

Mr. SMOOT. I thought I had previously explained it to the Senator.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator from Utah made no explanation that was satisfactory.

Mr. SMOOT. Then I can not give any other. The law provides an extension of one year.

Mr. WARREN. The bill alludes to the law of 1916; but there seems to be a difference between the Senator from Utah and others in regard to the law of 1916.

Mr. SMOOT. I can not give the Senator any other explanation than I have already given.

Mr. WARREN. Certainly there is nothing in this bill that carries the appropriation for 1916 beyond what the bill itself carries it. It can not be that way; and no explanation can cover it.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, all I ask in my amendment is that the \$75,000,000 provided for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, be eliminated from the bill. That will still leave \$125,000,000 to be appropriated for this purpose. With the \$125,000,000 and the \$70,000,000, provided the States put up their share, there would then be \$195,000,000 to be expended upon the building of this class of roads, and I think that is going a long way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] to the amendment of the committee. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think we had better have a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bankhead	Jones, Wash.	Moses	Smith, Ariz.
Beckham	Kellogg	Myers	Smith, Ga.
Colt	Kenyon	Nelson	Smoot
Culberson	King	New	Spencer
Fernald	Kirby	Overman	Sutherland
Fletcher	La Follette	Page	Swanson
France	Learroot	Pittman	Thomas
Frelinghuysen	Lodge	Pointdexter	Townsend
Gay	McCumber	Pollock	Trammell
Hale	McKellar	Pomerene	Vardaman
Harding	McLean	Robinson	Wadsworth
Henderson	McNary	Sheppard	Warren
Johnson, Cal.	Martin, Va.	Sherman	Wolcott

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I wish to announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] are detained by illness.

Mr. SPENCER. I wish to announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. NUGENT] are absent attending the sessions of the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-two Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] to the amendment reported by the committee. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COLT (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY]. In his absence, I will withhold my vote.

Mr. MOSES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MARTIN]. In his absence, I will withhold my vote. If privileged to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. NEW (when his name was called). On this amendment I am paired with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS]. If permitted to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. WOLCOTT (when his name was called). I transfer the general pair I have with the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] to the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS] and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. KENDRICK. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] to the senior Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] and vote "nay."

Mr. GAY. I wish to announce the absence of the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL] on official business.

Mr. MOSES. I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MARTIN] to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] and vote "yea."

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I inquire if the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not voted.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I transfer my general pair with the junior Senator from Montana to my colleague, the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BAIRD], and vote "yea."

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce the absence of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX], who is away on official business. He is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN].

I also desire to announce the absence of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] on official business.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I wish to ask if the name of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] was called and if he voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that the name of the Senator from Indiana was called, but he has not voted.

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS];

The Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY];

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH];

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN]; and

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED].

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 40, as follows:

YEAS—25.

Borah	Johnson, Cal.	McCumber	Sutherland
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	McNary	Thomas
Fernald	Kenyon	Moses	Wadsworth
France	King	Page	Wolcott
Frelinghuysen	La Follette	Sherman	
Hale	Lenroot	Smoot	
Harding	Lodge	Spencer	

NAYS—40.

Ashurst	Jones, N. Mex.	Overman	Smith, Ga.
Bankhead	Kellogg	Pittman	Smith, S. C.
Beckham	Kendrick	Polindexter	Sterling
Culberson	Kirby	Pollock	Swanson
Fletcher	McKellar	Pomerene	Thompson
Gay	McLean	Robinson	Townsend
Gore	Martin, Va.	Stafrath	Trammell
Gronna	Myers	Sheppard	Underwood
Henderson	Nelson	Simmons	Vardaman
Johnson, S. Dak.	Nugent	Smith, Ariz.	Warren

NOT VOTING—31.

Baird	Gerry	New	Shields
Brandeggee	Goff	Norris	Smith, Md.
Calder	Hardwick	Owen	Smith, Mich.
Chamberlain	Hitchcock	Penrose	Walsh
Colt	Hollis	Phelan	Watson
Cummins	Knox	Ransdell	Weeks
Dillingham	Lewis	Reed	Williams
Fall	Martin, Ky.	Saulsbury	

So Mr. SMOOT's amendment to the amendment reported by the committee was rejected.

Mr. KIRBY. I propose the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. At the end of section 6 it is proposed to add the following:

And provided further, That none of the funds herein appropriated shall be expended for improvements whereon convict labor is employed.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, it has been urged that this appropriation is necessary largely because it will furnish an opportunity for employment to returning soldiers and sailors. There is at this time, as one Senator has suggested, an insistent demand in the country that the soldiers who have not yet finished their education and intend to resume their studies should be discharged so as to permit them to do so. There is a crying need for all soldiers who have been engaged in agriculture heretofore to be discharged immediately in order that they may resume their occupations before it is too late to make another crop.

Now, in regard to the amendment here proposed, a great many of these roads will be built by contractors. The contractor is interested in building roads at as little expense as he can build them properly for and in getting as much money as he can procure for the construction. I do not believe that convict labor should be permitted to be employed upon the roads that are expected to be built under the provisions of this bill in order

to give free labor an opportunity for employment. If the contractor is permitted to employ anyone whom he may desire, he will probably procure convict labor.

I do not think that a man who has been a good citizen in his community, in his State, and in his nation, who has not violated the law but who has helped to bear the burdens of the Government and of taxation, should be competed against by the convict, who has not done these things. The man who has violated the law, who has not been a good citizen, and who has made it necessary that he should be convicted and imprisoned should not be furnished an opportunity to be employed to the exclusion of the other man.

I move the adoption of the amendment and hope the Senate will act favorably upon it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. KIRBY. I call for a division, Mr. President.

On a division the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After the word "marines," in line 15, page 37, it is proposed to insert the following:

But any other preference or discrimination among citizens of the United States in connection with the expenditure of this appropriation is hereby declared to be unlawful.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I think that should come after the word "marines," at the end of the proviso. It makes the proper connection there.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Washington to the amendment of the committee. [Putting the question.] By the sound the noes seem to have it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I call for a division, Mr. President; and I will say a word about this amendment. We allow a preference here in favor of the soldier. I am willing to have that done; but I am not willing that Government officials or anybody else, in the expenditure of Government money, shall discriminate among citizens of the United States in the expenditure of this money otherwise than as to soldiers. That is, I am not willing that an officer of the Government shall say: "You can not work on this road unless you belong to some organization of some kind or character."

That is the purpose of the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Washington to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, I have been requested by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] to call up an amendment which he has introduced to the bill, and I ask that it may be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 37, line 13, after the word "act," it is proposed to insert the following:

Provided, That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed for and in behalf of the Government of the United States to join in the construction of a tunnel or tunnels for the use of vehicles, animals, pedestrians, and vehicle-borne traffic under the Hudson River, between some point on the island of Manhattan, State and city of New York, and some point in Hudson County, State of New Jersey, pursuant to plans to be agreed upon by the parties aforesaid.

And for the purpose above stated the sum of \$6,000,000 is hereby authorized, \$1,000,000 to be paid out of the sum appropriated for the improvement of roads in the year 1919, \$2,000,000 out of the sum appropriated for the improvement of roads in the year 1920, and \$3,000,000 out of the moneys appropriated for the year 1921.

This money, however, or no portion thereof shall become available or payable until the States of New York and New Jersey shall within two years from and after the approval of this act have appropriated the sum of \$3,000,000 for the same purpose.

The United States Government is to be repaid for the money advanced for the construction of this tunnel by the paying of tolls on a basis to be fixed by the United States and the States of New York and New Jersey.

That the tunnel or tunnels constructed under this act, together with their approaches and terminals, shall be lawful structures and shall each be recognized and known as a post route, and is hereby declared to be a post route, and no charge shall be made for the transportation of the mails, the troops, and munitions of war of the United States.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, this amendment, proposed by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER], is for what is known as the vehicular tunnel under the Hudson River. In the recent strike of the boatmen on the rivers and bays of New York there were 500,000 people who were prevented for two days from being able to go to their business from New Jersey and Staten Island to New York. The movement of troops and property was delayed, the mails were de-

layed, and there was a great deal of embarrassment by reason of this condition.

New York City is a great national asset. Seventy per cent of our troops and 60 per cent of the supplies for the Army and Navy left the port of New York. New York and New Jersey in 1918 paid nearly \$1,000,000,000 into the Treasury of the United States, a sum much in excess of all of the States west of the Mississippi River and four times the total amount paid by all the States south of the Mason and Dixon line.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I do not know that I am opposed to the Senator's amendment, but I am utterly opposed to the comparison which he makes as to the amount which New York and New Jersey pay in comparison with the Western States. A vast amount of the income taxes, and so forth, of the Western States are paid in New York, but they are earned in the Western States. The great corporations of the West have their home offices in New York, and therefore the payments are made there.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Continuing, Mr. President, I will state that of the \$200,000,000 carried in this good-roads proposition, \$65,000,000, at least, will be contributed by New York and New Jersey, and the sum they will receive in return through this appropriation will be less than \$12,000,000. It is asked for by every business and manufacturing organization in New York and New Jersey.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I make the point of order against this amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator want it to go back to the original one?

Mr. SWANSON. If section 5 is in order—

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the original amendment is not general legislation, this is not.

Mr. SWANSON. I beg to differ with the Chair. I submit that this one is and the other one is not.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Well, the Chair will carry it back to the original one, if the Senator from Virginia wishes.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I should like to take it back and renew my point of order to section 5, if it can be done under the rules.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is not saying that it can be done; but the Chair is saying that he will not take up a part of this matter and decide that it is general legislation, and not decide the whole thing to be general legislation.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I renew the point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. To this amendment?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; and I ask that it be taken back to section 5.

The VICE PRESIDENT. This is the situation of the Chair: The Chair believes that this legislation is general legislation, but it was decided by another presiding officer that it was not. The Chair therefore concludes that the best thing to do is to let the Senate settle the question for itself.

Mr. THOMAS. I will raise the point of order when the bill comes into the Senate.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, may I ask what the parliamentary situation is? Does the Chair rule the whole amendment out?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has not done anything with it at all. The Chair is clearly of the opinion that the whole legislation is general legislation and ought to have gone out on a point of order; but it was not so decided, and if part of it is not general legislation then nothing is general legislation. A former occupant of the chair for the purposes of this bill having held that it is not general legislation, the Chair is not going to come in conflict with that ruling on this bill. The Chair refers the point of order to the Senate for determination.

Mr. THOMAS. That is satisfactory to me.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask for the yeas and nays on the question of whether it is general legislation.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, does an affirmative vote sustain the point of order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. An affirmative vote sustains the point of order.

Mr. SWANSON. That is, to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey?

The VICE PRESIDENT. To the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COLT (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before as to the absence of my pair, I withhold my vote.

Mr. MOSES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MARTIN], who

is absent. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] and vote "yea."

Mr. MYERS (when his name was called). Has the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. MYERS. I have a general pair with the Senator from Connecticut, which I transfer to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL] and vote "nay."

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). Has the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. STERLING. I have a general pair with the Senator from South Carolina. I understand that if that Senator were present he would vote as I shall vote, and therefore I am at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). Has the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. THOMAS. I have a general pair with that Senator and therefore withhold my vote for the present.

Mr. TOWNSEND (when the name of Mr. SMITH of Michigan was called). I desire to announce the absence of the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] on account of illness.

Mr. WOLCOTT (when his name was called). Making the same announcement and transfer of my pair as on the last roll call, I vote "yea."

The roll call was completed.

Mr. OVERMAN (after having voted in the affirmative). Has the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. OVERMAN. I have a general pair with that Senator and therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. PENROSE. I transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] to the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BAIRD] and vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS. I transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] to the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and vote "yea."

Mr. HARDING (after having voted in the affirmative). I note that the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] did not respond to his name. I therefore transfer my general pair with the junior Senator from Alabama to the junior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] and will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. SIMMONS (after having voted in the negative). I wish to inquire whether the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have a general pair with that Senator. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CUBBERSON] and will let my vote stand.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I should like to understand clearly the significance of a vote "yea" or "nay" on this proposition. It is not clear to my mind, and I believe that some other Senators are in doubt as to the significance of the "yea" and "nay" votes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair refused to decide the question. The question is, Is the amendment in order?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. A vote in the affirmative signifies that it is in order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It does.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I vote "yea."

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I think the question is altogether misunderstood, then.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I call for the regular order. The roll call can not be interrupted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Well, that is undoubtedly the rule; but Senators ought to know how they are voting.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, if I may say so, on an inquiry made by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS]—

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I make the point of order that under the rule the roll call can not be interrupted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is strictly true, and strictly the point of order ought to be sustained by the Chair; but surely—

Mr. LODGE. I think the rule ought to be either sustained or not sustained.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Surely the Senator from Massachusetts does not want the Senate to be voting with a mistaken idea as to the point on which it is voting.

Mr. LODGE. Of course if the Chair does not enforce the rule, I have no remedy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Very well. The Chair will sustain the point of order, at the suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. President, is a parliamentary inquiry in order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. According to the rules, it is not. The roll call is proceeding. The Chair wanted to make it straight if he could.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I wish to change my vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I desire to change my vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, I voted under a misapprehension. I desire to change my vote—

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. There is some confusion on this side of the Chamber as to the parliamentary situation. I request that it be stated. The statement has been made here that the vote was upon the question of sustaining the decision of the Chair. As I understand, it is a vote directly on the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

The VICE PRESIDENT. No.

Mr. ROBINSON. Well, what is the question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair wanted to explain, but the point of order was made that there was a roll call proceeding and that no explanations were in order, and the Chair had to sustain that point of order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair may be permitted to explain the parliamentary situation.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. But at least, Mr. President, give us the subject upon which we are voting. Let the Secretary state it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection?

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I do not object to the request of the Senator from Tennessee. I rise merely to state that I do not think it is out of order to make a parliamentary inquiry and ask for a statement of the question that is being voted upon. That is what I desire.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair refused to pass upon the point of order which was raised, and submitted it to the Senate. The vote must be, therefore, as to whether or not the Senate believes that this is general legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, upon that statement I desire to change my vote from "nay" to "yea." [Laughter.]

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, I desire to change my vote—

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President—

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. SWANSON. As I understand, it depends upon the form in which the question is put as to whether it is general legislation. It seems to me the question is, Is this legislation in order? If we think it is in order, we vote "yea." If we think it is not in order, we vote "nay."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Well, the Senate can vote on it in that way. The Chair does not care.

Mr. SWANSON. The question is, Which way did the Chair state it?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair stated it the other way, but the Chair thinks the Senator from Virginia has it right. That is what the Chair was trying to straighten out, but he could not; namely, Is the legislation in order?

Mr. SWANSON. That is all right. Those who think it is in order will vote "yea," and those who think it is not in order will vote "nay."

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, with that statement, I desire to change my vote.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings under this roll call be vacated, and that the question be restated by the Chair, and a new roll call be held.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none. Now, this is the question: Is the amendment in order?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, may the amendment be stated?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, my information was that the question submitted to the Senate was as to whether or not the amendment was germane to the committee amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Not at all.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I mean, the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMAS. That was not my point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order was that it was general legislation.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question to be voted on is, Is the amendment in order?

Mr. OVERMAN. What amendment? The amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey, as I understand?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. LODGE obtained the floor.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I think it is scandalous for Senators to sit here and vote without knowing what they are voting on.

Mr. LODGE. When the Senator from Montana is through I will address the Chair. Mr. President, I was only going to say that the usual method, as I have observed it here, when a question of order is referred to the Senate is whether the point of order is well taken; in other words, shall the point of order be sustained? The question is on the point of order. I think I am right in that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the point of order, and the Chair stated it originally as the Senator from Massachusetts has done; but upon reflection the Chair, not having ruled and leaving it for the determination of the Senate, believes the question to be voted upon is, Is the amendment in order? That enables the Senate to determine the point of order.

Mr. LODGE. When a point of order is submitted the Chair either overrules the point of order or declares that it is well taken. Now, that decision is submitted to the Senate. If the Senate considers the point of order well taken it votes "yea;" if it considers that the point of order should be overruled it votes "nay."

The VICE PRESIDENT. It really makes no difference how it is phrased, so Senators know how they are voting.

Mr. LODGE. Not the least. I quite agree.

Mr. HARDING. May I ask the Chair whether the decision on this specific amendment submitted by the Senator from New Jersey on behalf of the Senator from New York applies to the general good-roads appropriation?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It does not. It applies only to this particular amendment.

Mr. LODGE. It applies only to the amendment.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I should like to have the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington calls for the reading of the amendment, and it will be read.

The SECRETARY. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], for and on behalf of the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER], submits the following amendment:

On page 37, line 13, after the word "act," insert:

"Provided, That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed, for and in behalf of the Government of the United States, to join in the construction of a tunnel or tunnels for the use of vehicles, animals, pedestrians, and vehicle-borne traffic under the Hudson River between some point on the island of Manhattan, State and city of New York, and some point in Hudson County, State of New Jersey, pursuant to plans to be agreed upon by the parties aforesaid."

"And for the purpose above stated the sum of \$8,000,000 is hereby authorized, \$1,000,000 to be paid out of the sum appropriated for the improvement of roads in the year 1919, \$2,000,000 out of the sum appropriated for the improvement of roads in the year 1920, and \$3,000,000 out of the moneys appropriated for the year 1921."

"This money, however, or no portion thereof, shall become available or payable until the States of New York and New Jersey shall, within two years from and after the approval of this act, have appropriated the sum of \$3,000,000 for the same purpose."

"The United States Government is to be repaid for the money advanced for the construction of this tunnel by the paying of tolls on a basis to be fixed by the United States and the States of New York and New Jersey."

"That the tunnel or tunnels constructed under this act, together with their approaches and terminals, shall be lawful structures and shall each be recognized and known as a post route, and is hereby declared to be a post route; and no charge shall be made for the transportation of the mails, the troops, and munitions of war of the United States."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question as determined by the precedents of the Senate is, Is the amendment in order? That is the way the precedents read, though the Chair believes the Senator from Massachusetts is right. Is the amendment in order?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I shall vote, upon that statement of the question, "yea," believing that the amendment is in order, whether it is general legislation or not, because it is an amendment of an amendment which is general legislation. With the other amendment pending before the Senate, undoubtedly it can be amended by an amendment on the same subject. I desire to make this statement so as to make it clear that it does not indicate my opinion on the merits of the question. I expect to vote "nay" on the amendment when it is submitted.

Mr. SWANSON. I think the amendment is clearly in order, but I think it should be voted upon on its merits. I shall vote "yea."

Mr. SMOOT. Are we to understand that a vote "yea" means that the amendment is not general legislation and a vote "nay" means that it is general legislation?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes; if you vote that the amendment is in order you are deciding that it is not general legislation. If you vote that it is not in order, you are deciding that it is.

Mr. SWANSON. If we vote "yea" we decide that it is not general legislation?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Certainly.

Mr. SWANSON. If we vote "yea" we decide that it is in order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Certainly.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I wish to make a suggestion. I suggest that we take a vote direct on the amendment. If there are enough votes to put it in the bill, all right; if not, let it be defeated.

Mr. POINDEXTER. In order that there may not be any misunderstanding as to my vote on this matter, I do not vote with the understanding of the matter stated by the Senator from Virginia. He stated that a yea vote would be that it was in order and not general legislation. I think, on the contrary, it is in order and is general legislation. The question, I understand, is whether it is in order.

Mr. LODGE. That is all.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I understand that the money proposed to be appropriated here is to come out of the \$75,000,000 provided by the committee for 1920 and the \$75,000,000 provided for 1921, and as long as that amendment is pending it seems that an amendment of this kind would be in order, whatever might be the result on the general amendment as amended. The Senator from New Jersey proposes to take money out of money already provided in the amendment and to use it for a specific purpose. I think it is general legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The roll will be called.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I know the roll call has been started, but I want to know what the question is.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the amendment in order?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Then my proposition to vote directly on the amendment was rejected?

SEVERAL SENATORS. Let us vote!

OTHER SENATORS. Regular order!

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will proceed with the roll call.

The Secretary resumed the calling of the roll.

Mr. DILLINGHAM (when his name was called). Because of my general pair with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH], who is necessarily absent, I withhold my vote.

Mr. MOSES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MARTIN]. In his absence I transfer my pair to the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] and vote "nay."

Mr. MYERS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCLEAN] to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL] and vote "yea."

Mr. PENROSE (when his name was called). Again announcing the transfer of my pair, I will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before as to the transfer of my pair, I vote "nay."

Mr. WOLCOTT (when his name was called). Making the same announcement of the transfer of my pair as on the last vote, I vote "nay."

The roll call having been concluded, resulted—yeas 39, nays 18, as follows:

YEAS—39.

Ashurst	Jones, Wash.	New	Smith, S. C.
Bankhead	Kellogg	Nugent	Spencer
Beckham	Kendrick	Penrose	Sterling
Fletcher	La Follette	Pittman	Sutherland
France	Lenroot	Pollock	Swanson
Gay	McKellar	Pollock	Thompson
Gronna	McNary	Pomerene	Trammell
Henderson	Martin, Va.	Shafroth	Underwood
Johnson, S. Dak.	Myers	Sheppard	Vardaman
Jones, N. Mex.	Nelson	Simmons	

NAYS—18.

Borah	Harding	Overman	Wadsworth
Curtis	Kenyon	Page	Weeks
Fernald	King	Sherman	Wolcott
Gore	Kirby	Smoot	
Hale	Moses	Thomas	

NOT VOTING—39.

Baird	Colt	Fall	Hardwick
Brandeggee	Culberson	Frelinghuysen	Hitchcock
Calder	Cummins	Gerry	Hollis
Chamberlain	Dillingham	Goff	Johnson, Cal.

Knox
Lewis
Lodge
McCumber
McLean
Martin, Ky.

Norris
Owen
Phelan
Ransdell
Reed
Robinson

Saulsbury
Shields
Smith, Ariz.
Smith, Ga.
Smith, Md.
Smith, Mich.

Townsend
Walsh
Warren
Watson
Williams

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas are 39 and the nays 18. So the Senate decides that the amendment is in order. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CURTIS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK], but as he would vote the same as I would on this question, I am at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. DILLINGHAM (when his name was called). Again announcing my pair, I withhold my vote.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] to my colleague [Mr. BAIRD] and vote "yea."

Mr. MOSES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MARTIN]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. MYERS (when his name was called). I make the same announcement of the transfer of my pair as on the last vote and vote "nay."

Mr. PENROSE (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], and I am informed he is not in the Chamber. As I am unable to arrange for a transfer of my pair upon this vote, I shall refrain from voting. If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. TOWNSEND (when the name of Mr. SMITH of Michigan was called). I desire again to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. SMITH of Michigan] and that he is paired with the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. My colleague is absent on account of illness. This announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). Announcing the same pair and transfer as before, I vote "yea."

Mr. WOLCOTT (when his name was called). I make the same announcement of the transfer of my pair as before and vote "nay."

The roll call having been concluded,

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. SHIELDS] is absent on account of illness and that he is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE].

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY];

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN]; and

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX] with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN].

The result was announced—yeas 12, nays 48, as follows:

YEAS—12.

France	Kenyon	New	Thomas
Frelinghuysen	Lodge	Spencer	Wadsworth
Jones, Wash.	McNary	Sutherland	Weeks

NAYS—48.

Ashurst	Henderson	Nugent	Smith, Ga.
Bankhead	Johnson, S. Dak.	Overman	Smith, S. C.
Beckham	Jones, N. Mex.	Page	Smoot
Borah	Kellogg	Pittman	Sterling
Curtis	Kendrick	Pollock	Swanson
Fletcher	King	Pollock	Thompson
Gay	Kirby	Pomerene	Townsend
Gerry	La Follette	Robinson	Trammell
Gore	McKellar	Shafroth	Underwood
Gronna	Martin, Va.	Sheppard	Vardaman
Hale	Myers	Sherman	Warren
Harding	Nelson	Simmons	Wolcott

NOT VOTING—36.

Baird	Fernald	McCumber	Reed
Brandeggee	Goff	McLean	Saulsbury
Calder	Hardwick	Martin, Ky.	Shields
Chamberlain	Hitchcock	Moses	Smith, Ariz.
Colt	Hollis	Norris	Smith, Md.
Culberson	Johnson, Cal.	Owen	Smith, Mich.
Cummins	Knox	Penrose	Walsh
Dillingham	Lenroot	Phelan	Watson
Fall	Lewis	Ransdell	Williams

So Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN's amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MOSES. I offer an amendment to the committee amendment, which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire to the committee amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 37, line 15, after the word "marines," it is proposed to insert the following:

Provided further, That any money expended by the United States Government in the construction of military roads in any State to and from (but not within) any cantonment, aviation field, or any property used for military or naval purposes, shall first be deducted from the amount apportioned to such State under this appropriation.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, it is well known that many miles of enduring concrete roads have been constructed during the last year and a half by soldier labor in the vicinity of camps, cantonments, aviation fields, and other military establishments which were set up. Those roads will all be serviceable for postal purposes and will all inure to the benefit of the States within which they were constructed. This amendment seems to be wholly in line with the equitable view which the Senate is taking of this measure as a whole.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I hope the amendment will not be adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire to the amendment. [Putting the question.] The ayes seem to have it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I call for a division.

The VICE PRESIDENT. All those in favor of the amendment to the amendment will rise—

Mr. PENROSE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CURTIS (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK], and so I withhold my vote.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (when his name was called). Making the same announcement that I made before, I transfer my general pair with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] to the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BAIRD] and vote "yea."

Mr. MOSES (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MARTIN] to the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] and vote "yea."

Mr. MYERS (when his name was called). I make the same announcement of the transfer of my pair as on the last ballot and vote "nay."

Mr. PENROSE (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], and so refrain from voting. If I were permitted to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I make the same announcement of my pair and its transfer as before. I vote "nay."

Mr. WOLCOTT (when his name was called). Making the same announcement of my pair and its transfer as before, I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. PENROSE. I will transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] to the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE], who I note has not voted, and vote "yea."

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS];

The Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY];

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH];

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN];

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX] with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN]; and

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED].

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 28, as follows:

YEAS—28.

Borah	Henderson	La Follette	Nugent
Fernald	Johnson, S. Dak.	Lenroot	Penrose
France	Jones, N. Mex.	Lodge	Pomerene
Frelinghuysen	Jones, Wash.	McNary	Smoot
Gore	Kendrick	Moses	Spencer
Hale	Kenyon	Nelson	Sutherland
Harding	King	New	Wolcott

NAYS—28.

Ashurst	Fletcher	McKellar	Overman
Bankhead	Gay	Martin, Va.	Pittman
Beckham	Kirby	Myers	Poindexter

Pollock
Robinson
Shafroth
Sheppard

Sherman
Simmons
Smith, Ga.
Smith, S. C.

Sterling
Swanson
Thomas
Thompson

Townsend
Trammell
Underwood
Vardaman

NOT VOTING—40.

Baird
Brandegee
Calder
Chamberlain
Colt
Culberson
Cummins
Curtis
Dillingham
Fall

Gerry
Goff
Gronna
Hardwick
Hitchcock
Hollis
Johnson, Cal.
Kellogg
Knox
Lewis

McCumber
McLean
Martin, Ky.
Norris
Owen
Page
Phelan
Ransdell
Reed
Saulsbury

Shields
Smith, Ariz.
Smith, Md.
Smith, Mich.
Wadsworth
Walsh
Warren
Watson
Weeks
Williams

So the amendment of Mr. MOSES to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I have offered an amendment to this bill, on which I desire to submit some observations.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President—

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. BORAH. I yield first to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WEEKS. I send to the desk an amendment, which I ask to have printed and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that order will be made.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I do not know what the program is to-night with reference to adjournment.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. BORAH. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I announced on yesterday, that I would ask the Senate to remain in session to-day to consider this bill, and if it should not be passed before that time I would ask the Senate to remain in session to-night in order to dispose of the measure. I am still of the belief that that ought to be done; but I find so many old-young Senators here who appear to be exhausted from the day's session that I am inclined to make this suggestion: If we can get a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on this bill and all amendments thereto to-morrow at 4 o'clock, I shall be willing now to take a recess.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator means to begin to vote at that time, does he not?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I mean to vote during the calendar day, and I will ask that after 3 o'clock—

Mr. SMOOT. I suggest to the Senator that he make it 4 o'clock.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will ask the Senator to wait a moment—that after 3 o'clock to-morrow all speeches shall be limited to 10 minutes. Is that agreeable?

Mr. LODGE. And that the vote be taken before the end of that calendar day.

Mr. BANKHEAD. And that we shall vote to-morrow before the end of the calendar day on the bill and all amendments thereto.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator make that 4 o'clock?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Why?

Mr. SMOOT. I think it would be very proper to allow the discussion to run until 4 o'clock, and then after 4 o'clock have the speeches limited to 10 minutes each and vote upon the calendar day, as has been suggested.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Does not the Senator think that a 10-minute speech is enough from now on?

Mr. SMOOT. No; I do not, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I realize that the Senator from Idaho wants to make a speech, and I want him to make it, because he is always interesting and is going to speak on an interesting subject, and I want him to take all the time that he cares to occupy.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the Senator from Idaho does not really want to make a speech; he wants to have the amendment proposed by him adopted, and if it can be adopted without a speech—if that will be an inducement—he will not make the speech.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not think it can be adopted without the speech of the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. THOMAS. And perhaps not then.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think that it would be proper to limit the speeches to 10 minutes after 3 o'clock.

Mr. LODGE. The subject which the Senator from Idaho is going to bring up is a very important one, and I think he ought to have opportunity properly to lay it before the Senate.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I agree with that; but I think the Senator from Idaho can probably do that in an hour, and he will have ample time before 3 o'clock if he begins in the morning.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that I desire to offer a substitute for the road provision, and I want some time to explain it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is all true, and I want the Senator to have ample opportunity. Mr. President, I will change my proposition and suggest that we take recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow—

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator knows that we can not do that because of a conference that is to be held to-morrow morning, which will prevent Senators coming here.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Very well. How would it do to limit speeches to 10 minutes after 3.30 o'clock?

Mr. SMOOT. That will be all right, I presume.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Do I understand, then, that it is agreeable that at not later than 3.30 o'clock to-morrow all speeches will be limited to 10 minutes, and that we will vote on the final passage of the bill and amendments thereto during the calendar day?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

The SECRETARY. Mr. BANKHEAD asks unanimous consent that not later than 3.30 o'clock p. m. on the calendar day of Saturday, February 8, 1919, the Senate will proceed to vote, without further debate upon any amendment that may be pending, any amendment that may be offered, and upon the bill, House bill 13308, an act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, through the regular parliamentary stages to its final disposition, and that after the hour of 3.30 o'clock p. m. on said calendar day no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 10 minutes upon the bill or more than once or longer than 10 minutes upon any amendment offered thereto.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I move to strike out from the request as stated the words "without further debate." That is rather inconsistent with the allowance of 10-minute speeches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Well, it is generally understood what the proposition is, namely, a vote on all questions to the final passage of the bill itself by 12 o'clock midnight of to-morrow, and that after 3.30 o'clock to-morrow no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 10 minutes on the bill itself or on any amendment. Is there any objection among the Senators present?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I have no objection to the request as it has been stated by the Chair, but I have objection to it as read by the Secretary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Well, the phraseology will be changed.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I wish to ask whether or not under that agreement we could vote, if the time came to vote, upon any amendment prior to 3.30 o'clock?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Undoubtedly. If there is no objection upon the part of any Senator present, in accordance with the rule the Secretary will call the roll to develop the presence of a quorum.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Jones, Wash.	Myers	Simmons
Bankhead	Kellogg	Nelson	Smith, Ga.
Beckham	Kendrick	New	Smith, S. C.
Borah	Kenyon	Nugent	Smoot
Curtis	King	Overman	Sterling
Fletcher	Kirby	Penrose	Sutherland
France	La Follette	Pittman	Swanson
Frelinghuysen	Lenroot	Poinexter	Thomas
Gay	Lodge	Pollock	Thompson
Gore	McKellar	Pomerene	Underwood
Henderson	McNary	Robinson	Vardaman
Johnson, S. Dak.	Martin, Va.	Shafroth	Warren
Jones, N. Mex.	Moses	Sheppard	Wolcott

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-two Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. Is there any objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement, which will be stated by the Secretary?

The SECRETARY. The Senator from Alabama asks unanimous consent that on the calendar day of Saturday, February 8, 1919, the Senate will proceed to vote, without further debate, upon any amendment that may be pending, any amendment that may be offered, and upon the bill H. R. 13308, an act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, through the regular parliamentary stages to its final disposition; and that after the hour of 3.30 o'clock p. m. on said calendar day no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 10 minutes upon the bill or more than once or longer than 10 minutes upon any amendment offered thereto.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, as I understand the reading of the agreement, it says we shall proceed to vote without further debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On that calendar day, which will be up to midnight. By midnight the Senate must vote. It is in the regular form. There is no doubt about it.

Mr. POINDEXTER. At what time will we stop debate under that agreement?

The VICE PRESIDENT. In time to give a vote. The Chair has been in that predicament once, and started the vote about five minutes before midnight.

Mr. POINDEXTER. With the understanding that it will not be more than 15 minutes before midnight, I shall not object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will give the Senator from Washington all the chance he will need. Is there any objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement? The Chair hears none, and the unanimous-consent agreement is entered into.

OIL AND GAS LANDS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. BANKHEAD obtained the floor.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the adoption of a concurrent resolution authorizing the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] to sign the name of the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] to a conference report? The Senator from California is away, and the Senator from Nevada has a telegraphic communication from him, and we desire to have that consent given by the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a concurrent resolution, which will be stated by the Secretary.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 30) was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That Hon. KEY PITTMAN, as one of the Senate managers, is hereby authorized to affix the name of JAMES D. PHELAN, as one of the Senate managers, to the conference report on bill S. 2812, entitled "An act to encourage and promote the mining of coal, phosphate, gas, and sodium on the public domain," under oral authority and by telegram requesting such action.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes, Mr. President; I object to its presentation.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I do not understand the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. I shall object to the presentation of it at this time.

Mr. PENROSE. I join in the objection.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to know something more about it.

Mr. PENROSE. I want to look into it.

Mr. SHAFROTH. It is only a question of whether the Senator from Nevada can sign the report. The Senator from California is absent, and the concurrent resolution simply gives authority for the Senator from Nevada to sign his name to the report.

Mr. PENROSE. I object.

Mr. THOMAS. I understand an objection is made to that.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Does the Senator insist upon the objection?

Mr. PENROSE. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made, and the concurrent resolution goes over.

DAVID E. GRAY.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to call up and dispose of House bill 1607. It is a very simple matter, but it affects my State considerably. If it provokes any discussion I will withdraw it. It is a bill for the relief of a postmaster at Greeley, Colo., whose post office was robbed some years ago and who needs to have this bill passed for the purpose of settling his accounts.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill the title of which will be stated by the Secretary.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 1607) for the relief of David E. Gray.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit the accounts of David E. Gray, postmaster at Greeley, Colo., in the sum of \$10,088.09, due to the United States on account of postage stamps and other stamped paper on account of losses resulting from burglary of said post office on July 1, 1911.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CLAIMS AGAINST MEXICO.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senate seems to be in a good humor, and I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate resolution 399.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution which will be stated by the Secretary.

The Secretary read Senate resolution 399, submitted by Mr. KING on January 29, 1919, as follows:

Whereas claims aggregating millions of dollars in compensation for damages to property and for personal outrages and destruction of life, suffered by American citizens in the Republic of Mexico, have been filed with the Department of State for presentation to the Government of Mexico; and

Whereas some years have already intervened between the commission of such damages and outrages and no progress is apparently being made toward the liquidation, settlement, and payment of such claims: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, directed to report to the Senate whether or not said claims have been presented to the Government of Mexico, and what steps and measures are being taken to prosecute such claims and to liquidate and settle the same, and if said claims have not been presented, then to report to the Senate what steps and measures are contemplated to be taken with respect thereto and when the department will proceed with the same.

Mr. KING. The resolution has been unanimously reported by the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

MEMORIAL ADDRESSES ON THE LATE SENATOR HUSTING AND THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE DAVIDSON.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I give notice that at the proper time I shall move for a session of the Senate on Sunday, the 23d of February, to be devoted to memorial exercises for the late Senator HUSTING and the late Representative DAVIDSON, of Wisconsin.

RECESS.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Saturday, February 8, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, February 7, 1919.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou, who are supremely great and glorious, infinite in all Thine attributes, impart unto us that uplift of the spirit which shall strengthen our grip on the things which make for righteousness and broaden our views of life and its purposes, that we may go forward to larger achievements in the things whereunto Thou hast called us; for Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 4743. An act for the relief of Francis Stewart.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 13353) to extend the provisions of the homestead laws touching credit for period of enlistment to the soldiers, nurses, and officers of the Army and the seamen, marines, nurses, and officers of the Navy and the Marine Corps of the United States who have served or will have served with the Mexican border operations or during the war between the United States and Germany and her allies.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 1847. An act to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Wyoming National Forest.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 4743. An act for the relief of Francis Stewart; to the Committee on Public Lands.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the naval appropriation bill.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Is it in order to move that the House go into executive session?

The SPEAKER. Of course it is, when you have got anything to go in on. [Laughter.]

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Well, it occurs to me that we have got something to go in on. We have an appropriation asked here of \$700,000,000 which we are asked to vote upon because of a communication which is said to have come to the Committee on Naval Affairs which could not properly be made public. Of course the responsibility is upon the House, not exclusively upon the Committee on Naval Affairs, in making this appropriation.

It occurs to me that in view of the fact that it is not advisable to make public this communication the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs might be willing to move to go into executive session, where the communication would be kept entirely secret.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not think it would. I will say to the gentleman that I will show it to any Member of the House in personal confidence.

The SPEAKER. All this conversation is out of order. If the gentleman from Mississippi wants to make any remarks to the House, the Chair will recognize him for five minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Yes, Mr. Speaker. I did not know until now that Members of the House could see this telegram or that it was open to all Members.

Mr. PADGETT. I have shown it to several Members.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Yes. I had heard that several Members had seen it, but the House has not seen it.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; I will show it to you.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I can not see why the gentleman thinks it would not be kept secret if it were submitted to the House in executive session.

Mr. PADGETT. I have been on committees for 15 years, and we have been holding executive sessions, and everything that was done in executive session was published in the newspapers next morning. [Laughter.]

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Then, Mr. Speaker, if the House does not go into executive session and this communication is shown to every Member, every Member will know it. Of course, if they want to make it public they can do it just as well as if it were made known in executive session.

When I made the suggestion I did not know that the communication would be made available to the Members of the House. I do not make the motion to go into executive session, but I wanted to know if it would be in order if the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs of his own motion would make the motion to go into executive session, so that the matter can be presented and we can know what the situation is.

Mr. PADGETT. The truth is I have told the House already the sum and substance of it as plainly as I could, except to give the language.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I yield the floor, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the naval appropriation bill. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] will please take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 15539, the naval appropriation bill, with Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 15539, the naval appropriation bill, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 15539) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS.

Maintenance, Bureau of Yards and Docks: For general maintenance of yards and docks, namely, for books, maps, models, and drawings; purchase and repair of fire engines; fire apparatus and plants; machinery, operation or repair, purchase; maintenance of horses and driving teams; carts, timber wheels, and all vehicles, including motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles to be used only for official purposes,